



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2013

No. 136

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 o'clock and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 4, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

STOP DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FURLONGHS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Defense, "of the Department's 800,000 civilian workers, about half will be furloughed." That means President Obama, our Commander in Chief, in his sole discretion, publicly declared that roughly 400,000 DOD civilian employees are not "essential" to America's national security.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's furloughing 400,000 civilian Defense work-

ers violates the law while putting national security at greater risk.

Let me explain. If any one of three circumstances exist, then America's Defense workers should not be furloughed.

The first circumstance is if Congress passes a Defense appropriations bill, then the military is funded and the President has no legal basis for using the shutdown as an excuse for furloughing Defense workers.

Unfortunately, this first circumstance does not exist. While the House of Representatives, 4 months ago, passed the National Defense Authorization Act on a 315-108 bipartisan vote that included 103 Democrats, and while the House, almost 3 months ago, passed the Defense appropriations bill on a 315-109 bipartisan vote that included 95 Democrats, President Obama, Democrat Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, and their allies refused to allow the Senate to vote on either bill that would both fully restore Defense funding lost because of sequestration and fully fund America's national security.

The second circumstance exists if President Obama declares workers "essential." While I disagree and question why any Commander in Chief, in his sole discretion, would slight 400,000 Defense workers by declaring them superfluous to America's national security, President Obama did just that. Hence, the second circumstance does not prevent furloughs of civilian Defense workers during this shutdown.

This brings us to the third circumstance, the Pay Our Military Act. This act not only forces the President to pay our men and women in uniform; it does more, much more. It also bars the President from furloughing civilian Defense workers even if there is a government shutdown, even if they are not declared "essential," and even if Congress has not passed its Defense appropriations bill.

For those who wish to read it, google the Pay Our Military Act to confirm that what I say is true. The Pay Our Military Act states, in part:

There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2014 . . . such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to . . . civilian personnel of the Department of Defense . . . whom . . . are providing support to members of the Armed Forces.

Let me repeat that for emphasis. It states:

There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2014 . . . such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to . . . civilian personnel of the Department of Defense . . . whom . . . are providing support to members of the Armed Forces.

There is no requirement that civilian Defense workers be essential. The only requirement is that they provide support to members of the Armed Forces. For emphasis, there is also no requirement that the support be for Armed Forces who are in combat.

Mr. Speaker, every single civilian Defense worker supports the Armed Forces. By definition, that is their entire job. Hence, as a matter of law, there should be no furloughs of any civilian Defense workers.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, on October 1, I joined 67 other Congressmen in a letter to Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Acting Secretary of Homeland Security reminding them of the Pay Our Military Act and emphasizing that we are:

Disheartened that the administration chose to needlessly furlough workers against the intent of Congress and that since all DOD civilian employees serve to support the uniformed services, all of these civilians should be returned to work without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, the President, our Commander in Chief, is actively violating the Pay Our Military Act. The Obama administration must immediately return all 400,000 furloughed DOD workers to work. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because it's the law.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6227

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF
JANINE BENNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today is the last day on Capitol Hill for Janine Benner, my deputy chief of staff. Janine and her husband, Greg Dotson, a key member of the Commerce Committee, are a true Capitol Hill power couple—not the type that you see in the society pages of the Post or holding forth on the Sunday morning talk shows. When you see them on television, they are sitting next to a Member of Congress, helping them on a bill or an amendment to look smarter and do their job better.

Ms. Benner joined our offices as a legislative assistant in 2001, shortly after the 9/11 attacks, and leaves having seen Congress at its best and worst—the near meltdown of the economy, wars, and the shutdown. She has seen landmark legislation and made important contributions to many. She knows that we often make it harder than it should be, but that didn't stop her or discourage her.

History will judge what Congress has accomplished in her 12 years, but there's no doubt that Ms. Benner made it better with her countless daily actions behind the scenes and helping in meeting with thousands of people, listening, learning and helping them understand the mysterious ways of their government and how to be more effective.

Janine Benner was a colleague and mentor to hundreds of professionals and interns, not just in our office. She worked with them helping them learn and encouraging them to weave the tapestry of legislative activity. She brought her Ivy League education, passion, and commitment—especially to the environment—to help fine-tune opportunities on Capitol Hill to coax more value for the American people.

She led our staff efforts dealing with climate change and global warming. Janine helped manage and guide livability initiatives to make the Federal Government a better partner. She was a part of our initial work in 2002 in Johannesburg that led to our efforts with the Water for the Poor legislation and, more recently, with Water for the World, to help bring sanitation and safe drinking water for people around the world. She returned from the United Nations Climate Conference in Copenhagen in 2009, being a part of that hopeful and frustrating process with a renewed commitment to deal with energy and climate change and found ways to make a difference.

She organized and participated in my bipartisan 3-day backpacking trip around Oregon's magnificent Mount Hood with my colleague, GREG WALDEN, and his family and staff, working together to learn and build trust that led to the Mount Hood Legacy Stewardship Act that protected that Oregon treasure.

No Hill staffer knows more about the challenges, dangers, and opportunities dealing with natural disaster. She dove in behind the scenes working in the detailed minutia that brought about the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004. No Member or staff did more to make that happen and with ongoing efforts.

She continues to nudge the Federal Government to be more productive. She spent years to refine and modernize procedures for the Corps of Engineers.

Whether it's in Copenhagen or Johannesburg, flying over the Klamath Basin or hiking around Mount Hood or being in a Capitol Hill lockdown yesterday, she brought experience, good humor, and intellect not to just some bills enacted or amendments passed; she helped improve Federal agencies like the Corps and FEMA that need more attention. She took time off and did amazing volunteer work in key Oregon campaigns with spectacular results.

Besides being a good citizen, she is a proud mother to her darling daughter, Dahlia. She and Greg could live anywhere in America. They could make more money and not have questions about whether they're going to be paid or whether their employer was going to take away their health insurance, but they've chosen to serve the public, help Congress, and make the world a better place. It was an honor to be able to work with her. There is no one who better exemplifies the dedication, confidence, and commitment that holds this place together.

Thanks, Janine.

THE ADMINISTRATION IS CHOOSING
CALLIGRAPHY OVER OUR
MONUMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I came down to this well yesterday to talk about how for 20 years I have run back and forth to the Lincoln Memorial and how the day before yesterday I was shocked to run down there and see the place in chains. I had planned on making a run last night, and then tragically this shooting occurred here yesterday.

But it turns out there's some things that I didn't know about the Lincoln Memorial. In this shot, I had become so agitated, I had asked a tourist to take a picture. And it is an amazing picture of, again, the Lincoln Memorial without people, because what I have come to learn is that it has always been a place with people.

I didn't realize that in the last government shutdown, President Clinton elected not to close down the Lincoln Memorial. I didn't realize there had been 17 shutdowns in this country since 1976, and not one President elected to close down the Lincoln Memorial. That means President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, President Bush,

and President Clinton each, when given the discretion in how they would handle a shutdown, chose not to hold Americans hostage in somehow gaining political favor by a shutdown that would hurt them on their tour to Washington, D.C. In fact, what I came to learn is that in the history of the American Republic, the Lincoln Memorial has never been shut down.

So, my simple question would be: Why?

I think it's interesting that Dr. Martin Luther King came to its steps, and he talked about how the American Dream for many pieces of America and many people in America was in chains. And yet this President, for some reason, chooses to chain the Lincoln Memorial in a way that has never been done in the history of our Republic.

I don't know why he would do so, but what I can say is that it turns out he has a history of holding people hostage in a political equation that I think is very, very harmful, because in the sequester, he chose to end public tours to the White House. That means an eighth grader who may be making their one trip to Washington, D.C., over the course of their life is no longer afforded the chance to visit the White House as school groups have done, literally, since the time of Jefferson. Always that has been the people's house—not a palace, but the people's house.

What I came to learn here that I didn't know over the last 24 hours is that the White House, as it turns out, spends \$277,000 on a calligrapher. Now, you can either keep the White House open for tours for eighth graders across this country or you can spend \$277,000 on calligraphers. Now, what's a calligrapher? A calligrapher is a person who writes in very fancy prose on a very fancy invitation to rich folk to come to the White House. That's what a calligrapher is. And he would elect to do that? Or to take an extra trip on Air Force One? Or not to raise private money to open up the White House for tours?

It turns out, I've come to learn, in many cases, it's costing more to chain these public, open-air monuments, whether the World War II monument, whether the Lincoln Memorial, whether the Jefferson, in many cases costing more to rent barricade equipment than it is to take people out of furlough to have them there in ways that have never been okay.

So it is okay to agree that we disagree. It's okay to say you want to spend more, the House wants to spend less. HARRY REID wants to spend more, we want to spend less. I think the Congressional Budget Office numbers are on our side. What they show is that in just 12 years, we're going to be at a point in this civilization where there will only be enough money to pay for interest and entitlements and nothing else. And in that regard, what we see is simply a prelude to much greater problems in this country if we don't get our financial house in order.

So it's okay to disagree on those things, but it is not okay to try and inflict political pain to the American citizen as a way of somehow scoring a political point, particularly when this House has sent four different bites at the apple in terms of trying to keep government open, and particularly when this House has sent a bill over that would keep the national parks open, that would keep groups like NIH open, Guard and Reservists, go down the list.

So, I would come back and ask of you, Mr. Speaker, that we look for some way of, again, unchaining monuments that have never been chained in the history of this Republic, because I think they represent very silly political games by this President.

STOP PLAYING THE BLAME GAME, NAME CALLING, AND FINGER POINTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, day No. 4 of a government shutdown, day No. 4 of not doing our job.

To the folks in the gallery, if you sit here all day, you're going to hear people throwing the blame game and playing that blame game—Democrats blaming Republicans, Republicans blaming Democrats, the House blaming the Senate, the Senate blaming the House, and the House blaming the President. Let's stop this madness, and let's stop the blame game. Let's stop pointing fingers at one another, and let's just do our job.

Mr. Speaker, it's time we did our job. You're the Speaker of this House. This is the House that has both Democrats and Republicans. It's time that you were Speaker of this House.

Yesterday, one of our colleagues said that we're being disrespected by the other party and we won't be disrespected by the other party. This can't be about Democrats looking for respect from Republicans and Republicans looking for respect from Democrats. That's the problem. We've lost the respect of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this body, Congress, has lost the respect of the American people, and that's who we should be looking for respect from. Eighty-seven percent of America feels like Washington, D.C., is going in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, let's spend time working to earn the respect and the trust of the American people. This has to be bigger than political parties. It has to be about America.

Here is who deserves our respect: the United States Capitol Police. Did you see how great they were yesterday? They performed admirably. They did everything that they had to do, and they did so without getting paid. They're not getting paid. They show up, though. They do their duty, and they do their work. They deserve our respect, and they have the respect of

everyone in this body and the United States because they're doing their job. Mr. Speaker, if we want to get their respect back, we'd better do our job.

Here's some other people who deserve our respect. When I visited our troops in Afghanistan earlier this year, those are some of the most professional young men and women that I've ever met. When they're called and asked to serve, they just show up for duty. They do what they have to do—one tour, two tours, three tours. They are doing their jobs. They deserve our respect.

Mr. Speaker, if we want the respect of the American people, we need to do our job as Democrats and Republicans. You're Speaker of the House. Bring us together. The leadership needs to start coming together and doing their job. That's how we get the respect back.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women behind us, they show up every day. They're doing their job, but they're not getting paid. The way we can show our respect for them is let's open the government up, and let's make sure that the men and women in America get paid. Let's start rebuilding jobs. That's how we can earn their respect. Let's do our job.

Mr. Speaker, every year, thousands of Americans show up, young college students show up in Washington, D.C., to serve their country. They show up as unpaid interns. They show up as low-paid staff members. In my office, we have a young college graduate, Kelvin Lum. He shows up for work every day. He helps me deal and talk and manage the constituent requests that are coming in. He's not getting paid. Let's show our respect to those folks that care deeply about our country, about the United States of America. Let's open government up again.

Mr. Speaker, it's time that we work to get the respect of the American public. Let's do our job.

My father taught me a little bit about respect. He said: Son, the way you get respect is you don't ask for it. The way you get respect is you go out and do your job. You work hard. You do it with integrity. You don't blame others when things fail; you just work harder.

Mr. Speaker, let's get the trust and the respect of America back again by doing our job, which is opening up government, which is starting to put together a real budget that relieves our children and grandchildren of crushing debt that's coming at them. Let's do our job as Democrats and Republicans, listening to each other, taking the best ideas out of both parties and doing our job.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to get the respect of America back, we will do our job. The Democrats and Republicans in this body are ready to open government. We have the votes. It's up to you now just to bring legislation to the floor to let us open government again, to make sure our Capitol Police are paid, to make sure the men and women serving this country are paid, and to

make sure that tourists that are coming to the United States Capital to visit and show their respect for America are able to visit the monuments.

Mr. Speaker, it's in your hands. Let's do our job, and let's get that respect back.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members that the rules prohibit references to occupants of the gallery.

FISA COURTS: THE 21ST CENTURY STAR CHAMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, government secrecy is anathema to all people, and darkness by rulers can be trumped by the sunshine of a public and an independent judicial system. But, Mr. Speaker, secrecy by a judicial system is a threat to liberty of all free peoples.

In our country we have the Constitution; and, specifically, the amendments to the Constitution protect us as a free people against government—government intrusion and government violation of our privacy—because government really has no right; it has power. It has what we give it when we give up our liberty and our rights.

The amendments promote openness of government and protect individuals from government. There is the Sixth Amendment that talks about a public, speedy trial, where witnesses come forward and people are put on notice of the crime. Citizens are given a jury trial. But the most important part of that amendment is the right to a public trial.

The Seventh Amendment deals with jury trials in civil cases.

Of course, the Fifth Amendment talks about the fact that, in a trial, a person accused doesn't have to testify or produce any evidence against themselves.

And then the Fourth Amendment talks about how government is limited on how it can intrude into our homes and our papers. It limits government surveillance. And it's an inherent right that the government search be reasonable and based on probable cause, and that there must be a warrant drafted under oath describing the place to be searched, the persons and objects to be seized.

Now, this just didn't come out of our ancestors' minds because they thought it was a good idea. There are historical reasons for this. Maybe in our government public school system we ought to teach more about the history of liberty and why we do things the way we do under this Constitution. It goes all the way back to the 1500s in England when England invented this concept of the Star Chamber.

The idea was, well, we're going to be able to prosecute and go after nobles, certain people who are being able to get away with violations of the law. But the courts were made specifically to be secret courts where there were no witnesses, there was no indictment, and a person was forced to testify against themselves. So, obviously, it was abused. It was abused by the Kings of England, primarily Henry VIII, when he went after and fought his opponents by prosecuting them in those secret courts.

The United States doesn't have the Star Chamber, but we have the NSA—the National Spy Agency, as I call it—and the FISA courts, the 21st century descendants of the Star Chamber. The NSA and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act allows those courts under FISA to authorize searches of anyone. Those searches are not based on probable cause, and those areas are not specifically described to be searched. It is a general warrant concept that they used in England to search people in England that were political opponents of the government and of the King.

The spy courts in the United States started under the theory that we need to be safe from terrorists. But the NSA and the spy courts violate the Constitution in the name of security. Warrants under FISA are general warrants where NSA can seize phone records, NSA can seize credit card bills and utility bills. And we are learning now that they seize not only phone data but that NSA seizes bank records.

Also, the judges are far from being independent. They meet in secret—just like the Star Chamber did. They can't even keep the records of the proceeding. Those are turned back over to the government. There are no witnesses present—just like in the Star Chamber. There's no lawyers present for anybody—just like in the Star Chamber.

These FISA courts should be protecting American citizens and should be following the Constitution. They are supposed to act as the independent power between government and the people. But they're not doing that.

I call them the "Spy, Search and Seizure Courts" because they are operating in the darkness of tyranny. We don't know what they're doing. They allow the NSA to seize and violate the privacy of Americans in violation of the Constitution by seizing people's records under general warrants.

A general warrant is the idea that government knows there's a bad guy in the area, so the government wants to search the whole area of town for the bad guy. You can't do that. I used to be a judge. Government has to have probable cause. It has to give the address of the house, the specific area, state the probable cause. The warrant has got to be sworn to and be specific about the location and what government wants to search and what government wants to seize or it's a violation of the Constitution.

The spy courts—the NSA courts and the Star Chamber courts—need to be revisited. It's time to shine sunshine on the FISA courts and the spying of the NSA. The NSA and the FISA courts—the Star Chamber courts—have shut down the Constitution. Now it's time to shut down the unlawful surveillance and intelligence gathering by these courts on American citizens.

And that's just the way it is.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the government has now been shut down for 3 days, the people's government that is formed to serve it and promote the general welfare and the national defense. That government has been shut down. Entirely? No, not entirely. There are some sporadic incidents where, for the public safety, we have people working.

I read the papers every morning, clips, as so many Americans do, so many Members do. I start discussion of where we are today because surely the public must be confused.

The Republicans say that they don't want to shut down the government. They say that President Obama wants to shut down government and that we Democrats want to shut down government for political advantage.

Having said that, 99 percent of us are prepared to vote for a resolution at 12:01 this day to open the government, because that is the rational, common sense, and right thing to do. I tell Speaker BOEHNER, Mr. Speaker, that we're prepared to vote on that today, as soon as this House opens.

Now, the Governor of Virginia is a Republican. The Governor of Virginia wrote an article today that said:

Budgets are documents born of many compromises. A government shutdown represents the antithesis of that approach.

We agree.

He went on to say:

In a shutdown, planning and forethought go out the window. Instead of rational governing, we get speeches and inaction. That's not how government should work.

So we stand ready on this side of the aisle, I will say as one of the leaders of my party, to vote now to open government and, yes, to do what, in a democracy, we ought to do—sit down and discuss compromises.

Now, the American people, Mr. Speaker, need to know where we are and how we got here.

The process is that the House adopts a budget for the spending which keeps government open, and the Senate passes a budget that funds the government and keeps it open and serving the American people.

□ 1030

Now, often there are differences between the House and the Senate, as there are now. And so what our process

is is to go to conference, as the Speaker has talked about so often, to sit down at a table and discuss, as reasonable people, as Governor McDonnell says government ought to work, resolving our differences.

But for 6 months my Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, as you know, have refused to go to conference and sit down at the table. They have refused to try to bridge the gap. They have refused to do what Governor McDonnell says is necessary to do, compromise. And we are far apart.

Now, interestingly enough, we have only passed three appropriations bills out of the 12. All three of the appropriations bills that we passed through this House are at the Senate number—not the House-adopted number—at the Senate number. And so they have to slash the other nine bills very deeply. As a result, they have not brought them to the floor.

I have no power. I used to be the majority leader. I could bring a bill to the floor, as my colleagues know. I can't bring a bill to the floor now. One of those bills was brought to the floor and it was defeated. Actually, it was pulled from the floor because they couldn't pass it. So we are at a place where we are now, have shut down government.

The reasonable, rational, responsible thing to do is simply say we have enough votes to open government at the number that the Republican Party sent to the Senate. Not a compromise. We are telling them we will take your number. I don't like their number. But I like even less having government shut down, because it costs the economy money, it puts at risk our national security, and it undermines the confidence of the American people, not to mention the international community.

But we will take your number, I say to the Republicans, Mr. Speaker. We will take your number. The Senate has said we will take your number. But unfortunately, they haven't yet taken "yes" for an answer.

Now, earlier this week—and I don't know him—but Representative MARLIN STUTZMAN, who is a Republican from Indiana, said this: "We're not going to be disrespected." Now, by that I presume he means that the President and the Democratic Senate is not going to agree to undermining or repealing the Affordable Care Act that millions of Americans already are trying to access to get coverage and get health security in their families. He says, "We're not going to be disrespected." Then he goes on to say this, ladies and gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker: "We have to get something out of this. And I don't know what that even is."

Let me repeat that. He says, We have got to get something out of this, but I just don't know what it is. How are you going to negotiate in that context? I see Mr. McDERMOTT here chuckling. I'm chuckling. We need to get something out of this, but I just don't know what it is.

Now, after being asked about the GOP leadership putting a clean government funding bill on the floor for a vote, Representative TOM COLE, one of the leaders, close to Speaker BOEHNER, former chairman of their campaign committee, said this. When asked about putting a clean government funding bill on the floor for a vote, he said this: "Why in the world would we do that?" Now, they've said they don't want to shut down government—that's why they'd do it. Why does he ask such a question, "Why would we do that?" To open government so it can serve the people. That's why you would do it. How confusing can that be?

He went on to say this, however. "You know, that doesn't encourage anything. That's basically at this point a surrender to the Democratic position." Now, remember, ladies and gentlemen, I just told you that we took their number, their number that they passed through here. I don't like that number.

HAL ROGERS, the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, doesn't like that number. The subcommittee chairmen don't like that number. But we're saying, okay, yes, we'll take your number, let's keep government working for our people.

Now, the House majority leader, I used to be majority leader, or as I refer to it, the good old days, he said this: "We're trying to get the government open as quickly as possible." That's 12:05 p.m. today, ladies and gentlemen of this House.

Mr. Speaker, it's 12:05 p.m., 5 minutes after noontime, right now, you can get it open as quickly as possible. If that's what the majority leader wants to do, Mr. CANTOR, bring that bill to the floor and our side will overwhelmingly help you pass it and get government open for the people.

Now, the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee said this. He echoed CANTOR in an interview with the *National Journal Daily*, and he said this: "I don't think anyone wants to stretch this out for 2 weeks." But what we'll see today is little tiny slices of bills. It will take weeks and perhaps months to open at the rate they're going. "I don't think anyone," LANKFORD says, "wants to stretch this out for 2 weeks." Now, this is the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee. Here's what he said: "I'd like to resolve this this afternoon." We're ready. The American people are ready. It's the responsible thing to do. Get the government working for its people.

If Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. CANTOR want to get this done as soon as possible, I tell them as a leader on my side of the aisle, I will help get them the votes to pass it this afternoon, early this afternoon, by 1 o'clock this afternoon. Let's get this government open.

Mr. LANKFORD goes on to say, "I don't believe there's any argument for stretching this out for 2 weeks." This is their policy committee chair. "I don't believe there's any argument for

stretching it out." Why are we stretching it out if there's no argument to do so?

I close with this, Mr. Speaker. I also read the American people are angry. Let me tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, I share their anger. I am angry too. As Governor McDonnell said, this makes no sense, this is no way to run a government. We've taken the Republican number. Mr. CANTOR says he wants to act quickly. Mr. LANKFORD says he wants to act quickly. We will support acting quickly. Let's do it. Let's just do it.

Open the people's government today, not slice by slice by slice by slice over the coming weeks and months, but today for the people, of the people, by the people. Open the government today.

FIND A BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, our House Republicans remain committed to a bipartisan solution to reopen the Federal Government for the American people. And we continue to act in good faith to find an agreement with Senate Democrats to do just that. But to build a bipartisan compromise, the Senate needs to come to the table so we can work through our policy differences.

My colleague from Maryland gave a quote from one of our colleagues. But he neglected to mention that Senator HARRY REID said, "Why would we pass bills to keep the NIH operating and help children with cancer?" We've offered such a bill. And guess what? One hundred seventy-one Democrats voted against pediatric cancer research. One hundred seventy-two Democrats voted against funding the national parks. One hundred sixty-four Democrats voted against funding veterans benefits.

Mr. Speaker, that doesn't sound like people who want to get the government back open. HARRY REID said, "Why would we want to do a piecemeal approach?" Well, we all know, and the American people know, that the way we pass appropriations bills here, and the way we have the government running, is by passing individual bills. We have 12 different bills that we normally pass. The House has passed five and sent them to the Senate, and the Senate has acted on none of them. So now we are doing it the way it's supposed to be done, under regular order. We are bringing the bills to the floor and passing them. And yet the Senate will not act on them.

What about the barriers at the memorials, Mr. Chairman? Isn't it a shame that barriers have been put up at our outdoor memorials that have never had barriers put up before? They are always open 24-7, 365 days a year. Why deny World War II veterans the opportunity to get into their own me-

morial? How petty is that, Mr. Chairman?

Make no mistake, House Republicans want to reopen government and stop shutdown policies before they cause any more pain. But if the Senate will not meet with us to build a bipartisan solution to end the government shutdown, we'll continue to take the lead to fix problems for the American people.

We want a fair government. And on those two things, an open government and a fair government, Democrats and Republicans should agree. But there are a few hang-ups. Shouldn't principles of fairness apply to ObamaCare? My colleagues in the House and I say yes. Big Business and other well-connected groups are getting a 1-year delay from ObamaCare, courtesy of the President, to prepare for its drastic changes, brace for its higher costs, and study up on its mountains of regulation.

American families and small businesses who apparently don't have the same pull with the White House aren't going to get the same treatment. And further, many are losing the health care they like and would prefer to keep, or are having to find insurance through ObamaCare exchanges without any help from their employers. That isn't right. At the very minimum, these Americans deserve to have the same delay big businesses have to prepare for ObamaCare's drastic changes, brace for its higher costs, and study up on its mountain of regulations.

Mr. Chairman, we remain committed to a bipartisan solution to reopen the Federal Government. And that's where we need to go. But rather than building off of common ground and fixing those problems for the American people, the President and the Senate are reflexively saying no. Preserving problems as leverage is wrong.

Help us do the right thing for the American people. Help us end the shutdown and ensure fairness under ObamaCare. It's time for the Senate to join us at the negotiating table and achieve fairness for all.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly saddened by what has taken place the past few days with the closure of the government. We are participating in a downward spiral that has no end in sight. And we've lost the ability to relate to ordinary Americans. It's important to talk about how our actions, our inactions here in Washington affect the very people that we represent.

I want to talk to you today about two people who have been impacted tremendously by the actions of this House to close down government. Let me begin with one of my constituents,

who is an FAA safety inspector who has been furloughed. He has been furloughed, as I mentioned, from his job as a Federal Aviation Administration aviation inspector because we have not been able to keep the government open.

He reached out to me, and I have here his letter. He reached out to me and asked that I share his concerns with all Members of Congress and with the public at large. He made it clear to me that he was not here to talk about or to ask me to minimize the hardship that is going on in his family. Instead, he wrote that he wanted to express his concerns that the aviation inspectors will not be on the job to ensure the safety of U.S. travelers.

My constituent, a retired Army officer, veteran, wanted me to specifically talk about four safety functions that are now not being performed by FAA inspectors under this government shutdown. First, surveillance of aircraft, pilots, both domestic and foreign repair stations have been halted, leaving aircraft maintenance and aviation operations unchecked.

Second, in-flight cockpit inspections have been suspended, meaning that safety inspectors are not in the air overseeing aircraft, pilots, flight crewmembers, and in-flight operations and procedures.

Third, ramp inspections are not being conducted at airport gate facilities. This is not just here in Washington, but nationwide. This increases the probability of risks not being identified between destination points.

And fourth, even more frightening is that aviation safety inspectors are not on duty to respond in the event of an aircraft accident. How tragic this is.

But the second one even touched me more. Maybe not more, but certainly equally as much. This is about a young lieutenant at a local Los Angeles County police department who has worked for the past 2 years to be accepted into the prestigious FBI National Academy. This 11-week program, which is paid completely without Federal funds, was a once in a lifetime opportunity for him to pursue his dreams and contribute to the safety of our country.

The government shutdown Tuesday, however, crushed his dreams because this 11-week program began on Monday. All he wants do is to go to his classes, but he can't, because there are no instructors. They have been furloughed. This program has 212 of the brightest and most dedicated law enforcement officers from 24 countries and 48 States. If the government does not quickly reopen, they must go home, every single one of them.

Mr. Speaker, do not send these people home. We are witnessing political brinksmanship in its purest form. The American people have no time for these games. And I did not come here to participate in unnecessary political brinksmanship. I came to provide solutions and resolve problems. Instead of pitting Americans against Americans using this piecemeal approach that my

colleagues across the aisle have decided to do to keep the government open, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to declare victory, use their own budget numbers, and vote for a clean CR that will last until mid-November. Don't hold our government hostage any longer.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN PERSPECTIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, just a quick minute to reflect on the previous speaker.

First of all, as a former chairman of Transportation, chair of the Aviation Subcommittee, if the FAA Administrator is not ensuring that safety positions, including inspectors that are key to safety, that those positions are filled and manned during this shutdown, he should turn in his resignation immediately. I can tell you he has the discretion to make certain that safety and our Essential Air Service inspections are conducted. So this is a game that's being played by the other side.

Secondly, the gentleman spoke to a non-Federal program. There is no reason that any program that's supported with private money can't continue. We've seen this game played this week, poking veterans in the eye, poking even minorities in the eye.

If you have been to Washington and seen the World War II Memorial, it's an open space. And to put up barriers, and to put Park Service personnel out there to put fences up to prohibit the public and our veterans from walking into that open memorial, is an offense. To do the same thing to the Martin Luther King memorial is an offense to our minorities and all Americans.

So this is a game that's being played. I have seen it played, you know, just a short time ago. And it's good to have some institutional memory on FAA. The other side controlled this body. Now, they controlled the House, the Senate and the White House in huge majorities, they could not pass an FAA reauthorization. They did 20 extensions. During those 20 extensions, you know what happened? They left all of our safety policy, they left our advancements in technology, our Next Generation air traffic control programs, all in the lurch. And here they are talking about a 4-day disruption. And they did the same thing to me.

I sent over to Mr. REID, after the 20-some extensions, I sent to him a clean extension with one caveat: you couldn't have Essential Air Service, a Federal program in which you gave more than a thousand dollars per ticket subsidy. That was offensive to him because he was giving \$3,720 per airline ticket subsidy. And he held up the legislation for 2 weeks. We had a partial shutdown of FAA for 2 weeks.

They called me every name in the book. I was a one-man Tea Party ter-

rorist cell. The President, I heard him talking about holding a gun to the head of the Senate. That's what they used against me. They've used this before, they are using it again. They had an opportunity to do some of these things, they didn't.

They couldn't even pass a budget. The only reason they passed a budget this year was we put No Pay, No Budget. All of their 4 years. So let's look at the record. How did we get ourselves into this situation? They spent that 4 years passing a health care bill that they told us we would know what was in it after we passed it, and we found out.

The President 17 times has changed provisions in it that were in law. He gave an exemption to business people. He gave exemptions to his friends. He changed the law. Many of us wanted to do away with the law. We know that has gone into effect. We have asked for a reasonable approach to negotiate and change some things that need to be changed.

Let Members of Congress and the White House staff and others be subject to ObamaCare. Let's have some relief for individuals for some time. But you can't do that if you won't negotiate. If you are golfing on Saturday, as the President was doing, if you don't show up for work on Sunday, like the Senate didn't do, if you come to work on Monday at 2 o'clock, you don't get the job done. And then if you go to the White House and you don't sit down and talk or negotiate, you won't get it done.

We're here, we're going to be here 24-7, our leadership is committed to stay over the weekend, next week until we get it done, until we open the government, until we get the finances of this country as it careens down the path to possible default. Seventeen trillion, asking for another trillion of indebtedness. From \$9 trillion to 17 going to 18, double it in what—5, 6 years of this administration? Spending out of control, large government programs that do need our attention. We need to be responsible. We need to be accountable. We need to take any law, whether it's ObamaCare or others, and make certain that our people do have health care and do the best job possible working together and compromising.

SHUTDOWN DAMAGES THE POLITICAL PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I say good morning to our colleagues, and hope that as we focus on the very real pain and burden that so many Americans are feeling that we can act this afternoon to alleviate that pain, whether someone is looking for health care services from the National Institutes of Health, or whether they are troubled by the problems at the FAA that Mr. LOWENTHAL just talked about,

or whether they are veterans or a person in our police departments or military, that we can alleviate the suffering they are feeling and we can again have taxpayers receive the services for which they are paying by passing the Senate short-term budget this afternoon.

It's pretty clear to me that a significant majority of House Members would vote in favor of that budget. It should be put on the floor. If I am wrong, it will fail. But we will have a vote. I think I'm right. I think the bill will pass, the government will reopen, and the shutdown will end. That's the way we ought to proceed. If a majority of this House believes that that's the right thing to do, the majority should be given the chance to vote on that particular piece of legislation.

I hope we can also focus on the long-lasting damage that's being done to the way we govern our country by what has happened here. I want to say from the outset that I feel strongly that the Affordable Care Act is a good thing for our country. I really do believe that that's going to do many good things for our country. But I completely respect and admire those who have a completely different opinion.

I know that there are many Members of this Chamber, and many people in our country who believe that the Affordable Care Act is very bad for our country. They would like to see it repealed. They believe it will do harm to the country. I respect and admire their zeal and their passion. This is the essence of the democratic process. We are fortunate to live in a country where when we disagree over something we resolve our disagreements with voting, with elections, with peaceful and civil processes.

But when that peaceful and civil process protects the rights of those who have lost an argument, as frankly those over the Affordable Health Care Act have, when it respects your right to continue to come back and pursue your views over that argument, you also have to respect that process in return. And grave damage is being done to that process because of this practice of threatening a shutdown of the entire government, in fact causing a shutdown of the entire government, and now threatening a default on the country's obligation to pay its bills by tying the health care debate to the extension of the Federal debt ceiling.

And I want you to think about what is happening here. The health care legislation came to this floor and passed. It went to the Senate floor and it passed. The President signed it. It was challenged in the United States Supreme Court. The United States Supreme Court said it complied with the Constitution. We had an election a little less than a year ago, where one candidate promised that the very first thing he would do would be to repeal the law, and the other candidate promised he would implement the law. The candidate who wanted to repeal the law

lost, lost in the Electoral College by a substantial margin, lost the popular vote by about 51 to 47 percent.

That does not mean that those who agree with Governor Romney have to abandon their efforts and try not to repeal the law. The democratic process says they have at their means every legitimate mechanism to try to win the next time around. That's part of the beauty of American politics, there is always a next time around. But it is not a legitimate means to shut down the entire government of the United States because you lost the last time around.

Let me draw some analogies here. Virtually everyone on our side believes passionately that the Senate immigration bill, which would provide legal status to 12 million people, the vast majority of whom are decent, tax-paying, hardworking people who are benefitting the United States, we believe passionately that that bill should become law. Sixty-eight Senators voted for that law. It has never been put to a vote on the House floor. We feel passionate that should become law, but we did not threaten to shut the government down if we didn't get a vote on that. It looks like we may lose that argument. If it doesn't come to a vote, we are not going to shut the government down because we can't get our way.

A huge majority of people on our side, a huge majority of the American people, if you believe the polls, believes that there should be a background check before someone can buy a gun. Before a wife beater or a terrorist can buy a gun, there ought to be a background check that says whether they can buy one or not. Again, we are damaging the political process by this, and we shouldn't do it.

□ 1100

INTELLECTUAL CONSISTENCY FROM THE LEFT NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those moments where you come to the floor—I am unscripted—and I want to sort of share something from the heart that actually has really, really disturbed me watching this debate over the last few days.

I am from Arizona and I like to say I am a friend of Gabby Giffords, and I have known her for a very long time. Do we all remember 3 years ago when this House came together, when my media in Arizona and the media across this country said, whoa, maybe it is time to actually take a step backwards and reflect on our use of language, reflect on our tone, reflect on our civility.

Yet look what you have heard over the last two or three days, over this last week. I have a President that got

behind the microphones and was literally talking down the stock market, asking why hasn't it gone down. I have one of the heads of the intelligence services fearful that the intelligence service officers are bribable now because some are on furlough. I have had Members come to the microphone right off to the side of me here and use language like "terrorist." The White House has stood behind the use of the language of "gun to the head." You want to talk about something that is offensive? And this is to all my brothers and sisters here in Congress and for the blogs and the reporters and the political operatives around this country, you are better, we are better than this.

A good example is you just heard the Representative from New Jersey come to the microphone. I can only say nice things about his tone. He made his argument in a rational, constructive way. We have different views of the world. There was none of the flailing of the hands and the screaming into the microphone. And you have to start to take a step backwards and wonder, why the theater, why the viscousness and the theater coming from the left.

I hope we don't look back a month from now and find out that some of this was about money, fund-raising, the politics of cash; because the reality is this argument is actually pretty darn simple. Those of us on the conservative side believe we have and we have reached out over and over. And if you really want a solution, and this is to Senator REID, send over some Members to that conference committee. Put them in a room and let them start talking.

I am from that view of the world that a big deal is healthiest for the country; but then I will hear language like, well, we are heading toward the debt ceiling and you are going to default. Anyone that says that is looking you in the eyes and lying to you, either that or they don't own a calculator. You have got to understand the math. This country takes in 18 percent of GDP in taxes, and we pay out 2 percent in debt coverage. And in 2014 we have, what, \$1.6 trillion in refinancing.

The fact of the matter is any way you ladder the model, we are never, ever, ever—and I am also quoting Bill Gross from a couple of days ago—we are never never, ever, ever, it is implausible that we won't make our interest payments. You have \$3.1 trillion we are going to take in in tax revenues. We are going to spend about \$3.7 trillion. So using language like, well, we are going to default, has the left decided that they are hungry to scare the markets, hungry to scare the world debt markets, and is this how you leverage politics?

Look, I understand we have different views. I actually believe the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is part-timing America, is destroying so many people's opportunities. But I also do believe we do have to come up with solutions and continued solutions for pre-existing conditions for someone with

severe asthma. But we have our vision, we want to get to the same goal.

So to my friends on the Democrat side, particularly over in the Senate, 2 years ago you lit up my phones in my office demanding that we talk and negotiate on other issues. So that rhetoric was acceptable in the summer of 2011, but today it is not? How about just a little bit of intellectual consistency from the left?

SETTING ASIDE POLITICS AND PUTTING NEEDS OF CONSTITUENTS FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, it is day four and I am just amazed that this government shutdown has been allowed to continue even though we have the votes to end it right now. A bipartisan majority of this House supports the Senate-passed so-called "clean continuing resolution," but for some reason Speaker BOEHNER won't allow a vote. People back home in Oregon and across the United States don't understand this. The majority of the House, a majority of the Senate, and the President agree on a deal that would reopen the government, but it is not going to happen because the Speaker won't allow a vote.

This is hurting our constituents. One of mine wrote about her family's effort to save enough money for a house, but she is on indefinite furlough, unpaid time that she didn't ask for, didn't deserve and can't afford. Another had planned a trip to visit the Grand Canyon; but after making reservations and buying tickets, the park won't be open and her family's trip will be ruined. Someone else wrote about her pregnant daughter who relies on WIC and won't receive the nutrition assistance she needs.

Yesterday, a volunteer at the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge said that years of conservation and restoration work could be set back because there will be no staff on duty to manage the water levels. Researchers at our State's universities, like Oregon State University, had to put projects on hold. They have been unable to collaborate with Federal agencies, important deadlines are being missed, new grant applications aren't being processed.

These are just a few of the stories I am hearing. The shutdown hasn't just affected one agency or one constituency. It has affected everyone who relies on a functioning Federal Government. And, Mr. Speaker, it is chipping away at what is left of the respect for this institution. We can't afford to use any more precious time on piecemeal bills that we know won't go anywhere. It is time to set aside the politics and put the needs of our constituents first.

Mr. Speaker, I understand, as does America, that you and some of your Members do not support the Affordable

Care Act. We understand that. We got that message. But it passed both Chambers, was signed into law, and was upheld by the Supreme Court.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't like the across-the-board cuts caused by sequestration. They are harming my district and this country, and I will continue to fight them. Yet I am ready now to vote for the clean continuing resolution that contains those cuts. Why? Because it is critical to get the government open now. And every indication is that a majority of this Chamber will do the same.

Mr. Speaker, let us reopen the Federal Government. We can do it today. Mr. Speaker, please let us vote.

MAKING WASHINGTON, D.C., LESS IMPORTANT AND LESS POWERFUL IN THE LIVES OF AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, this is a frustrating time in Washington. For the first time in 17 years, our government has been shut down. I believe the political gridlock is at a discouraging high mark. I empathize with those who are feeling its devastating effects, especially those hardworking people who have been affected by furloughs, including some members of my own family.

So I rise today in defense of the American people and I ask one simple question: Why won't the President and HARRY REID sit down and talk to us? The American people are hurting. They want to see progress. They want to see us work and fix this in a bipartisan way. So why won't the President and the Senate leader sit down and engage us in a simple conversation? What are they afraid of?

The President of the United States is the President of all of the people. He is not just the President of the Democratic Party. He is not just the President of those States in which he won. He is the President of the United States. He is the President of everyone. He owes it to the American people to listen to their voices. So let me ask again, what is he afraid of? Why won't he sit down and talk with us?

I represent more than 700,000 people in my home State of Utah. They want the government to stay open, but they do not want ObamaCare. They know what a horrible piece of legislation it is. They know and they already see that it is destroying jobs. They know it is hurting working families. They know that it is driving up costs. They want the President to know this. They want HARRY REID to listen to their concerns, but both of them refuse to talk to us.

So let me ask again, what are they afraid of? Are they afraid that they might be actually convinced that we are right? Are they afraid that they might have to compromise just a lit-

tle? I am the father of six children. I know what it is like to have teenagers in the house. I know what happens when they get angry because they don't get their way. They run to their bedroom, they slam the door, and they refuse to come out and talk.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for our President to take out his ear buds, to open the door, to come out and talk to us. He has canceled his trip to Asia. But I ask why, for what purpose, if he still refuses to come out and talk to us.

My goal throughout the last several weeks has been to find a way to fund the government operations, other than ObamaCare, and to avoid a government shutdown. But once again, unfortunately, President Obama and Senator REID have expressed no willingness, no willingness at all to compromise.

We have to understand that we are engaged in a generational fight over our debt and spending as it goes far beyond ObamaCare. Our current national debt is approaching \$17 trillion, and it is growing every moment. During this administration, we will more than double our national debt; but it doesn't just end there. This is about the reach of government into our lives, with ObamaCare just being one example of how our government has grown too large and too powerful. In addition, this law will come with something like a \$1.3 trillion price tag. That is something that we simply can't afford.

It is critical that we work together now to reduce the size and the power of government in our lives. House Republicans have repeatedly come to the table to negotiate over the past several weeks. So once again I ask, what are they afraid of? Why won't they sit down and talk to us? As a former President, one of my heroes, John F. Kennedy said, let us never fear to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to do everything in my power along with my other colleagues to find a solution to reopen the government while fighting to make Washington, D.C., less important and less powerful in the lives of American citizens.

PUTTING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BACK TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, we are in day four of the Republican shutdown, an irresponsible and manufactured crisis designed to promote ideology at the expense of the American people.

Let's be clear about why House Republicans have so knowingly, carelessly, and recklessly shut down our government. We have heard it on this floor today, Mr. Speaker. It is because they continue to be obsessed with eliminating the Affordable Care Act, the law of the land that is being implemented right now. It has become apparent that they are willing to sacrifice the basic functions of the U.S.

Government just to prove that point. Again, ideology and politics over people.

Right now there are nearly 1 million men and women who work for the Federal Government, good people, my neighbors and family, who signed up to do a job in the service of their Nation, and today they are not at work. They have had to either take a furlough, now missing four days of work, some of whom were already furloughed earlier this summer with the sequester. That means they are laid off, and they are not working because their work isn't essential. They are not getting paid.

Now, for those of us who are old enough to remember it, it kind of reminds me of the cartoon character in Popeye: I will gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today. Now, the Capitol Police and many other Federal employees that are deemed essential are in fact working. We heard that yesterday with their courage and their valiant service to this Capitol. But they are not being paid. Many have worked what would equal overtime this week due to the various protest rallies and yesterday's car chase, but they are not being paid.

Now, this shutdown is not just about faceless bureaucrats. It is about real people, about public servants who are directly affected by the shutdown, and I want to tell you about a few of them who live in my congressional district.

Pat from Gambrills, he and his wife are both Federal employees so in that household it is about 8 days of furlough. They, like many of their fellow colleagues, will experience extreme difficulties if the government defaults in just another couple of weeks. Pat contacted my office and he urged the President, my fellow Democrats, and me not to bargain with Republicans in regard to increasing the debt limit and getting government operating. It is our job, he said. Though they are experiencing difficulty, Pat stated, I believe it is more important not to negotiate or bend to blackmail. Republicans must learn that they must follow the same rules as the rest of us or there will be consequences. Those are Pat's words.

But I also want to tell you about some others who contacted my office like Tracy out in Laurel. She works at the Department of Health and Human Services. She helps her mother pay bills every month; and when she called my office, she was crying, she was in tears, because she wants this to stop so that she can pay her bills.

Then there was Dini who lives in Oxon Hill—and I live in Oxon Hill—who is a single parent who was already furloughed earlier this summer, and now she isn't sure how she is going to pay the bills or take care of her child. In fact, some of these workers still have to pay childcare to keep the spot in daycare, even though they are not being paid and they are not working.

Then there was Christopher. He and his wife are both employed at the De-

partment of Homeland Security in support of the security of this Nation. They were both furloughed earlier this summer, and they are furloughed now.

So those are just some of the stories, and I could go on. I have sheets and sheets of calls from workers who live in my congressional district; and, you know, those Federal workers have already paid a great price. They are the folks out at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, which is located in the county I live in, in Prince George's County, a premier research institution; and 3,397 employees who would normally be at work aren't there. Only 104 of them are, and only 60 are working full time while the other 44 are working part-time. That means that also 250 of them are on call, and so 90 percent are actually furloughed out at Goddard Space Flight Center.

But it doesn't just affect Goddard. It affects all those small businesses, restaurants, shops, gas stations where civilian employees normally go to do their business, but they are not going there now. So the impact isn't just for the Federal workforce.

This is a really terrible situation, Mr. Speaker, and I really implore the leadership of Speaker BOEHNER. I know that he is a good man, and I want him to have the courage to put a clean Senate-passed CR on the floor of this House so that the majority of the House can work its will. Now, I know 40 or 50 won't, but the majority of the House should be allowed to work its will.

RETURNING AMERICA'S COMPETITIVE EDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the 800,000 Federal employees who have been furloughed for 3 days in the government shutdown. We can argue back and forth about who caused the shutdown, but the fact is that 800,000 people have been furloughed, and it could stretch into a week or two.

While we need to work hard to get these people back to work as soon as possible, we must remember that according to the Congressional Budget Office, ObamaCare is costing us 800,000 jobs permanently. We are not talking about working people being furloughed for a few days. We are talking about the permanent loss of 800,000 American jobs because of this job-killing health care law. Where is the outrage over that?

You see, the fact is the President and my friends across the aisle like to say that they are for the working man. They are for American jobs. But if you pay attention just a little bit, their actions belie their rhetoric. The truth is they are not the party of the working man; they are not the party of jobs. My friends across the aisle are the party of

Big Government and more regulation. They believe the American people cannot be trusted to make their own decisions, like how to invest their money or whether to buy health insurance. They know better than the American citizen. They want to make your decisions for you, to take care of you. ObamaCare is just the latest job-killing iteration of their Big Government expansion.

You see, it is only common sense. You don't have to be a genius to understand it. Big Government and Big Regulation do not grow the economy; they stifle the economy. They don't create jobs; they kill jobs. We have 7.3 percent unemployment right now, anemic growth four years after the recession ended; 15 percent unemployment among those under 25; 50 percent of recent college graduates are either unemployed or underemployed. I have got three sons who are recent college graduates. They have lived it. We are failing our young people.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Democrats held the Presidency, the Senate, and the House for 2 years and out of that came ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank, two of the biggest government-expanding job-killing laws to be enacted in decades. It is no accident that the economy remains weak. It is no accident that unemployment rates are so high. And now when the Republican House asks simply for a conference, they won't even sit down to discuss it. They refuse to accept anything but the status quo. What is the status quo? Record deficits, high unemployment, and anemic economic growth. I guess with a record like that I wouldn't want to sit down and discuss it either.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody here wanted the government to shut down, but perhaps it is good that we have come to this point. Maybe the government shutdown will be a catalyst that brings us together to make some hard decisions. We have got to stop thinking on six-month time horizons and create long-term certainty if we want our economy to thrive.

Tax reform, deficit reduction, entitlement reform—these are issues that everyone knows must be faced to push our economy forward and to return America's competitive edge. If we could resolve just a couple of these issues, we would lift a cloud of uncertainty, our economy would grow again, and all Americans would benefit.

Nobody wanted this shutdown, but let's take lemons and make lemonade. Let's use this crisis to come together for once and resolve some of these fundamental issues. These are the issues we were sent here to face. I plead with the Senate and the President to rethink your hard-line no-negotiation stance. America is counting on us.

KEEPING TOUGH IRANIAN SANCTIONS IN PLACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have checked with the Parliamentarian and he has informed me that it is in order to give a bipartisan speech, even today. So I have a speech that I think most Members, on both sides of the aisle, can agree with. Mostly.

I have been here 17 years. I have been working every day for the toughest Iranian sanctions. This House has passed bill after bill. The Senate passed about half of them. And for over a decade, several administrations have basically refused to enforce the Iran sanctions that passed both Houses of Congress.

Then about three years ago, this Administration started enforcing our sanctions laws. They unleashed the Treasury Department's Office of Terrorist Financing and Intelligence, (TFI) and its Office of Foreign Asset control, (OFAC). TFI and OFAC are doing a great job. Yes, something the Federal Government is doing is working.

Iran's supreme leader was forced to allow one of his own insiders to run on a reform platform. And the Iranian people voted for the most reform they were allowed to vote for. It is clear that Iran wants out of these sanctions and is willing to surrender critical parts of its nuclear weapons program, but only if we are very tough in sanctions negotiations.

Let us remember why there is nothing more essential than preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Iran's supreme leader, on his Web site today, says the Holocaust is a myth and wants to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth. Iranian troops are in Syria backing Assad. Iran is the number one state sponsor of terrorism.

Now, imagine terrorism with impunity. There is nothing more essential than stopping Iran's nuclear program. In order to do that, we need more sanctions. Why? Because every day Iran develops ways to get around the existing sanctions program. That is why we need to do a bit more as they are undoing what we already have in place.

But what is actually happening? TFI and OFAC are basically shut down, 90 percent furloughed. Seventy percent of our Intel Community's civilian employees are on furlough.

So what needs to happen? First, re-staff TFI and OFAC. These are essential government functions. Second, pass a clean CR because all aspects of our foreign policy, our national security operations, our intel operations are critical to keeping Americans safe from terrorism and stopping the Iranian nuclear program. And just as critical is our credibility worldwide. So it is time to drop demands that everyone knows the Senate and the White House will never accept, and pass a clean CR.

Third, it is time for the executive branch to use the statutory authority we have already given them. For example, they have designated about two dozen Iranian banks, cutting them off

from the international system. It is time for them to designate all Iranian banks.

Fourth, the Senate needs to pass a bill that passed on this floor with 400 votes last July, The Nuclear Iran Prevention Act.

Staff the agencies, pass a clean CR, designate all the Iranian banks, pass and implement The Nuclear Iran Prevention Act; and we may just see a world safe from the Iranian nuclear weapons program.

STOP THE POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot we disagree on around here. By now virtually every American knows that we disagree on ObamaCare. We ought not allow what divides us to stop us from coming together on issues where we all agree. There is nothing political about passing bills to help sick kids or pay our troops or open our national parks, or bills to help low-income women and children.

In recent days, the House has passed bipartisan bills to fund the areas of government like those I just discussed where we all agree. Each of these bills passed the House with dozens of votes from my Democratic colleagues. Each of these bills were unilaterally rejected by Senate Leader HARRY REID. The President has publicly declared that he will veto any of these bills if they reach his desk.

Let me repeat: the House in recent days has passed bills to help sick children, pay our troops, open our national parks and help low-income women and children. Dozens of my Democratic colleagues have voted for those bills. And the President and HARRY REID refuse to have them even considered. Why? It is awfully cynical to oppose helping people who are being hurt by the government shutdown, a shutdown, by the way, caused by the President's refusal to participate in the democratic process and negotiate.

□ 1130

Clearly, President Obama and Senator REID are putting political leverage before the American people, and that is wrong. This shouldn't be about politics. It shouldn't be about the inside baseball games of Washington and who's going to win and who's going to lose in this debate; it should be about the American people. We have very big areas in which we disagree.

This is a time where that debate is coming to a head. Many of us believe the Federal Government is far too big. Many of us are concerned about a Federal Government that is \$17 trillion in debt and robbing the next generation of their opportunity to live the American Dream. Many of us are concerned about ObamaCare and what it will mean to live in an America where government is in charge of 17 percent of our econ-

omy. Some on the other side of the aisle, disagree on each of those issues, but we do have areas where we agree. Common sense dictates that we would act on them.

I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue supporting these commonsense proposals, and I urge Senator REID and the President to do the right thing and allow those bills to become law. The American people don't want a government shutdown, but they also don't want the President's health care law. It's time for both parties to listen to the people, work out our differences, and find a common way forward.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, good morning, and good morning to my colleagues. I think that a greeting always sets the tone for conciliatory and direct and honest interest in bringing people together.

There are many of us that come from different segments of this Nation and therefore have to respond to our constituency, and I respect it and if I might use a term that we use sometimes, I get that. But I rise today to call upon our higher angels and the recognition that this is America's country, and to disabuse my colleagues and my friends on the other side of the aisle on some of the misinterpretation that they have represented in the dialogue and debate on this floor.

Numbers are showing that 60 percent of Americans don't want to have a government shutdown just to defund ObamaCare. I don't know how often that polling number has to be repeated and how often that number has to be noted as reflecting the sentiment of this country. But even more importantly than that, we're always told as we pledge allegiance to the flag that it is to this great Nation and it is because we are in fact united under one sense of commitment to our country.

And so yes, the President is acting like a leader of the Nation. Maybe he's even acting like a parent. I'd ask the question, Mr. Speaker, whether or not you had two children or five children, whether or not you would say to two of them: You're my favorites, you're going to get everything, you're going to eat every day, and the rest of you, you can fend for yourself.

That is the very nature of the piecemeal debacle that the Republicans are putting on the floor. I would have asked them, they could have done this in regular order 6-8 months ago in this House. They are in charge. They did not do that. They have not finished all of the appropriations process. But we have in fact compromised, Democrats, the President, by putting a continuing resolution on the floor of the House that is the exact number that the Republicans in the House and the Senate

wanted. And so in 31 minutes on this floor, they would have the opportunity to introduce that legislation, have it pass by a majority of this House and have the President of the United States sign it.

But instead of that, they want headlines like in the *Houston Chronicle* that has a mother, Talisha, asking: How am I going to feed my children? Because they're going to be cut off in the month of November for the funding for food stamps, even though it has suffered a horrible blow by this House of Representatives with a cut of \$40 billion, but with the House not ceding to the will of America, a government shutdown, they won't be able to get that minimum support, so a mother says: How am I going to feed my children? And then, of course, someone else indicates what is going to happen to mothers with newborn babies and others. That is the problem that we face today.

Let me talk about the NIH. I am a cancer survivor, and I am very concerned about those who are dependent upon research. Just a few weeks ago, I was engaged with a number of children who are impacted by the disease. I represent the Texas Medical Center and MD Anderson and the Texas Children's Hospital. Why would I want to vote against the NIH? But this own body has already cut \$1.55 billion because we have already been under sequester which is a devastatingly odious process, and it already accounts for the loss of 1 million jobs and already some \$2 trillion-plus being cut from this budget. Already, the economic pundits say that's the absolute wrong way to go because it does not create jobs, it takes away jobs. But I will tell you that Mary Woolley, president of Research!America, says:

On a micro level, this particular approach of allegedly funding parts of the NIH does not work. We are concerned that an incremental approach to the shutdown disrupts lifesaving research by other Federal agencies.

Benjamin Carr, the director of public affairs for the American Society of Biochemistry, also disagrees with this piecemeal funding, and Chris Hanson as well.

Now the leader in the other body has been charged by doctors, people showing up in a doctor's uniform at a press conference, saying he said something negative about children with pediatric cancer. He did not. What he said is he responded to Senator SCHUMER's comment that we shouldn't do a piecemeal type of approach, and he agreed with that. "Why should we do that?"

And so we should not be going against each other, we should be going toward each other. NASA is concerned about monitoring of the space station, and the Affordable Care Act is working. So, Mr. Speaker, I offer an olive branch as well. That olive branch is let's stop calling each other names, and let's start working on behalf of the American people and vote on a clean CR.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and talk about the things we're doing here in this House to continue to fund government and keep the government open. If you look at what has been going on the last couple weeks, Mr. Speaker, you have seen more than four bills passed by the House of Representatives to fund all of government. You've seen us send bills over to the Senate to keep government open. But what you've also seen, Mr. Speaker, is the President of the United States and the leader of the Senate refusing to take up the bills because they're not getting everything they want. The Senate President, HARRY REID, said he's not going to budge an inch—not an inch—from his position. He'd rather shut the government down than to move one inch. President Obama said he won't negotiate. He refuses to negotiate with Republicans unless they give him everything he wants. He won't budge an inch. So what we've done in the House, Mr. Speaker, during that time is say: You know what? We're going to put a lot of options on the table because we do believe we ought to fund government properly. We ought to address the problems facing our country and get our economy moving again, and address all the problems that the President's health care law is facing.

But we also know that we live in a democracy, and when you've got divided government, Mr. Speaker, that means both sides ultimately have to come together. That's what our laws actually demand. And yet you've got a President saying it's my way or the highway; if I don't get everything I want, I won't budge. And then you've got Republicans saying: Let's pass bills to keep things going; let's actually negotiate and work out our differences.

I think the American people are realizing that, Mr. Speaker. They're seeing the unreasonable approach of President Obama. If you look at what has happened in the House the last few days, you're actually seeing a groundswell not just of Republican ideas to keep government funded. We passed a bill to fund veterans. Shouldn't we all, while we've got all of these other disagreements on government—there are actually areas where Democrats and Republicans agree. You don't hear a lot about it, Mr. Speaker, but there are a number of those.

So we've started putting those ideas on the table and saying we have some real disagreements over health care policy, but shouldn't we at least fund our veterans? Shouldn't we at least fund cancer treatment for those patients that are struggling through cancer that aren't looking at this from a Republican or Democrat issue; they just want their treatment? And so we passed a bill, and it got bipartisan votes in the House. It was not a par-

tisan vote. A lot of Democrats joined with Republicans to say let's at least fund cancer treatment while we're negotiating these other differences. And the Senate majority leader's answer was: Why would we want to do that? How shameful, Mr. Speaker, that you would have the Senate majority leader saying he would rather hold them hostage unless he gets everything he wants. Nobody gets everything they want in a democracy. And so we continue to pass bills to address these problems.

We passed bills to fund our National Guard troops. Again, large bipartisan votes—a growing number, by the way, of Democrat votes that have been joining with Republicans—to take a reasonable approach to this, because again, "my way or the highway" is not how you govern in a democracy. You send those bills over to fund our veterans and to fund our National Guard and to fund cancer patients. And you literally, on a party-line vote, have the Senate leader saying he's going to kill those bills until he gets everything he wants, and is forcing every Democrat in the Senate to vote with him, to play some kind of partisan game. That's not how our democracy works, Mr. Speaker.

And where's the President's leadership on this? You should see the President standing up and saying stop these games; stop punishing people; stop taking hostages. And yet he's so afraid to stare down the Senate majority leader that he sits on the sidelines and continues just to throw rocks at people instead of getting in the fray and saying, as all adults in a room, let's get together and work out our differences. The President continues to say he won't budge an inch.

And so today, Mr. Speaker, we're going to continue moving forward in the House. As a tropical storm enters the Gulf of Mexico, we're going to take up a bill that says we ought to fund our emergency response in FEMA. Shouldn't again we at least be able to put partisan differences on the side on other issues that are unrelated and say at least we ought to take care and respond to disasters. That bill will be on the floor. And I'll predict, Mr. Speaker, that you'll see broad bipartisan support to vote that bill out of the House and pass it over to the Senate. Maybe, just maybe, let's all hold out encouragement that the Senate majority leader will finally put his partisan differences on the side and say let's at least agree to do that. Don't hold hostages.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when you look at what the President has been doing with these monuments, punishing the American people. The World War II Memorial is a great example of the greatness of America, the Greatest Generation, a tribute to those men and women who risked everything. You had heroes in their 20s that stormed the beaches of Normandy. They stared down the enemy. They didn't blink. Of course,

they came earlier this week to the World War II Memorial to see the memorial that was built in their honor, and they're faced with Obamacades blocking off that memorial. I'm glad they stared it down, they didn't blink, and they took that memorial.

Mr. President, tear down those Obamacades. Let our veterans into the World War II Memorial.

FIGHTING ON BEHALF OF THIS GREAT COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to speak from the heart of a true story that's happening really right now in my district. It's a story of an innkeeper, Bruce O'Connell, who's operated the Pisgah Inn since 1979. It's an inn on the Blue Ridge Parkway, and that inn has been operated really at no cost to the Federal Government for years and years and years. In fact, as he operates it, he sends money to the Federal Government. So this government shutdown shouldn't have anything to do with the Pisgah Inn. The Blue Ridge Parkway is open for business. It continues to allow cars to go both ways on the parkway. But yet what we see is under the direction of this administration, the edict has come out to close the inn down.

Yesterday, they had to close it down at 6 clock. So I got a call this morning from Bruce, and he says Congressman MEADOWS, I just want to let you know that I'm going to open my inn back up.

Now I expected to hear all kinds of just heartfelt hurt and concern from Bruce. But what he said is that you're fighting for the right thing. You're fighting for our future. You're fighting for our children. You're fighting for our grandchildren. And I'm going to open back up knowing that the cost of this particular thing may cost me a business that I've had for many, many years. But you know, Congressman MEADOWS, it is the right thing to do, that we must stand together and fight. We must make sure that what we do is, our voice is heard. So I want to say thank you to a patriot who is willing, at great cost to himself, stand and fight for what he knows is right.

And I'm going to close with this because this fight is not a new story. On the back of the Delaware quarter is a horse and rider. Many people think it's Paul Revere, but indeed it is not. It is an unknown or little-known patriot by the name of Caesar Rodney. His statue is in this very building. It's on the back of a quarter commemorating what he did because, actually, he got on a horse when the founding of our Nation was there, he got on a horse and rode through the night, through driving storms, to arrive in Philadelphia to cast the deciding vote that created this great country.

Now why do I share this story? Because across his face was a green scarf

that covered a cancer that could be best operated on back in England. So he knew that by signing that document, he potentially was signing his death warrant.

It is that kind of patriotism, Mr. Speaker, that we are seeing day in and day out. It is exemplified by the men and women across this country—World War II veterans who have come in and crossed a barricade. They fought, and many patriots died, for the cause of freedom. And I just want to say thank you to the patriots across this great land that are standing up to fight on behalf of this great country.

FUNDING NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 4½ minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we have this debate over opening the government, I want to talk about an agency that people are not thinking about.

The National Institutes of Health started in 1887 in one room, the Public Health Service Hospital in Staten Island, New York. It was modeled on something that the Germans had been doing for a number of years that was called the Laboratory of Hygiene.

In 1891, it came to D.C.

In 1901, they built the first building. The appropriation was \$35,000. It was for the investigation of infectious and contagious diseases.

In 1912 in St. Louis, 12 kids died when they got a diphtheria vaccine that was contaminated with tetanus. At that point, they decided they would pass the Biological Control Act, and that was given to the Institutes of Health. Joseph Goldberger, a doctor, discovered the cause of the pellagra, which was a scourge of the South in this country, a dietary deficiency because of bad diet. That came from the Institutes of Health.

In 1930, a Senator from Louisiana by the name of Ramsdell started the National Institute, one, the National Institute of Health. It was to give fellowships to physicians to study problems in the health care system. That situation went on from that day to this day.

Now they tried to do it in the private sector. After the First World War and all of the problems of chemical warfare, the Congress said let the private sector figure out how to do it, and they couldn't do it. They couldn't find anybody to finance it, and so they came and established the National Institute of Health in the government.

In 1937, they added the National Institute of Cancer. And in 1938, they built the first building up in Bethesda, Building 6.

Now until the Second World War, they discovered and worked on various things, and then the war came, and they spent an enormous amount of effort trying to figure out the health

problems of this country. People don't realize, 43 percent of the people who were inducted or brought forward to be inducted into the Army were rejected because they were unfit physically. The National Institutes of Health went to work on that. There were a whole variety of issues—diet, teeth, syphilis, all kinds of things that were not being done in this society, and they did the initial research on that.

In 1946 after the war, they decided we've got to expand this thing and they began creating new Institutes of Health. One was arthritis and metabolic diseases. That's where we started working on diabetes. Then they did allergy and infectious disease, which is what went on to deal with AIDS.

In 1970, there were 15 Institutes of Health. Today, there are 27. All over this country in every university and everywhere you look, there are scientists and physicians who are submitting grants to the Institutes of Health on issues that affect all of us. It has been the practice until very recently that one out of five of them is accepted. One is good, four are not so good. We're going to pick the one that's good and put our effort there. We are down at the point where we are now doing 6 out of 100; 6 out of 100. This country that boasts about our health care system is killing it by this kind of bill, by squeezing the National Institutes of Health to death.

Mr. Speaker, bring out a clean bill and let's start up the National Institutes of Health.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Barry Black, Chaplain of the United States Senate, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, today, give our lawmakers the wisdom to do what is right, led by You instead of political expediency.

Forgive them for the blunders they have committed, infusing them with the courage to admit and correct mistakes.

Lord, illuminate their minds so that they will find a solution to the current impasse, embracing Your purposes and doing Your will.

Continue to sustain our law enforcement agents and first responders, inspiring us to emulate their patriotism

and self-sacrifice, going beyond applause to ensuring they receive fair and timely compensation.

Bless this land we love so much and save us from our self-inflicted wounds. We pray in Your powerful name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal. The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DOD CIVILIAN FURLOUGHS

(Mr. TURNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, as you and I have discussed, Tuesday morning, 8,700 employees at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base were unnecessarily furloughed. I have voted every single time to fully fund the government, and I have opposed this shutdown. This shutdown is just as harmful to our military readiness as sequestration is, which I also opposed because it undermines our national security.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Pay Our Military Act was passed by this Congress and signed by the President to ensure our Nation's uniformed servicemembers and the civilian employees

that support them would be paid in the event of a shutdown. The administration has chosen to ignore this law and force our civilian employees to sit at home and go without pay.

I have written to Secretary Hagel and President Obama demanding clarification as to why they have chosen not to follow the law and have furloughed these hardworking people. The Armed Services Committee is holding a hearing to get to the bottom of this clear defiance of the law by the administration.

It is past time that we get all men and women back to work and those who work to support our military.

NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the tens of thousands of men and women who work in one of the fastest growing manufacturing regions in America, Houston and Harris County, Texas.

Today is National Manufacturing Day. In our district, which covers the Port of Houston and the Houston Ship Channel, there are over 125 chemical manufacturers, refiners and supporting facilities, employing over 33,000 people.

The chemical, oil, and gas industries are the new face of manufacturing in America. Houston is the energy capital of the world and has benefited from this energy renaissance taking place in Texas and the gulf coast. Houston has been the national leader in job creation in recent years and was named America's number one exporting region by the Department of Commerce in July of this year, sending over \$110 billion in manufactured exports overseas.

I proudly stand with America's manufacturing sector, which is the backbone of our Nation's economy and our middle class. I look forward to this Chamber taking up legislation this Congress to provide the support and statutory clarity our manufacturers need to continue being the international leader in innovation and exports.

REMEMBERING NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the essential contributions manufacturers make to our country. Manufacturing accounts for 47 percent of national exports and 93 percent of exports from my home State of Illinois. In fact, on its own, American manufacturing would be the 10th largest economy in the world.

There are approximately 17,000 manufacturing companies creating jobs in Illinois, and nearly 25,000 of their em-

ployees work in the 14th District. These men and women produce items we use every day, like plastics, furniture and food products. Other companies rely on them for commercial printing and creating industries vital to industry.

Colleges in my district have recognized the promise of advanced manufacturing and have started programs to train the next generation.

While our economy struggles to jump-start on this National Manufacturing Day, let's recommit to protect this crucial sector of our economy.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, the worst-kept secret in Washington, DC, is there is a majority in this House to pass a clean CR. In fact, this morning, a list of 21 House Republican Members who said they would vote for a clean CR was published. It would end this idiotic shutdown that is keeping 800,000 Federal employees from doing their job.

Unfortunately, a few minutes ago, the official Speaker announced that he is not going to listen to the will of this House. Instead, we're going to do these salami-sliced spending bills. And, incredibly, we're going on recess on tomorrow through Monday night.

Well, Monday morning in Stratford, Connecticut, thousands of defense workers at Sikorsky Aircraft are not going to be able to go to work because the contract compliance officers from the Department of Defense who haven't been on the job for the last week can't certify the helicopter parts and engines that allow them to do their work.

Those layoffs are on this Speaker's head. Those layoffs are on the majority party's head.

Allow the majority of this House to have a vote. There are 21 of your colleagues that are prepared to do it today, and the President would sign it tonight. Those workers could go to work on Monday and protect the warfighters of this country.

AMERICA NEEDS TO BE AMERICA AGAIN

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, even though the President continues to bully the House by threatening to veto every bill we pass, the House of Representatives continues to act on behalf of all Americans.

Yesterday, we passed the Honoring Our Promise to America's Veterans Act to fund critical veterans programs of the VA and to ensure proper funding for National Guard and Reservists. Defying common sense, most of my Democratic colleagues chose to turn

their back on our veterans, National Guard, and Reservists.

Today, we will act again to provide immediate funding for a critical program that takes care of low-income women and children—the WIC program. HARRY REID's Senate has already refused to step forward and provide funding for sick children, and it would be inexcusable for them to not take up this legislation.

HARRY REID's government shutdown continues to last, and there is still no sign of willingness to sit down with House Republicans to negotiate. President Obama has even canceled his trip to Asia; but, Mr. Speaker, I have my doubts he will actually use his time to continue the important conversations that must happen to end this government shutdown.

I urge my Democratic colleagues in the House and HARRY REID's Senate to do what's right for the American people and pass these important funding bills immediately. America needs to be America again.

END THE SHUTDOWN

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in the early hours of the morning on Tuesday morning, I, along with a number of my colleagues, left our offices to walk over to the House floor to vote after the government had already been shut down. We passed on our way a cleaning crew who was down to half staff—half of her team not here to clean our offices.

We are not the ones that make this Chamber function. Yet we are clearly sending home those that do. They're not a line item in a budget. They've got rent and mortgages to pay, mouths to feed, and children to clothe. But because some of my colleagues have decided that it's better to shut down this government than to provide millions of Americans access to safe and affordable health care, here we are.

As you all know, the Affordable Care Act was modeled upon the health care reform we have already conducted in Massachusetts. So it's worth taking a quick look at where that Massachusetts health reform stands.

We have 100 percent of all kids covered. We've got 98 percent of all adults covered. We've made certain that no person is now one bad accident or one bad gene away from medical bankruptcy. Regarding cost containment, our rates have increased for individuals, and premiums are at a 1.8 percent increase this year.

We need to get this bill done, and I ask for your help.

WHAT AMERICANS WANT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, what the American people want from their elected representatives is very much the opposite of what this body has been delivering. Americans didn't want this shutdown, but here we are. They didn't want to lose the health care plans they have, but a very large number will in the future. They wanted lower health care costs, but insurance rates continue to escalate.

In Pennsylvania, the Children's Health Insurance Program provides good-quality, low-cost, market-based health care coverage. My constituents don't want their children forced out of this program and into Medical assistance, but that's now happening.

If the legislative process worked, we would have amended the so-called Affordable Care Act's fatal flaws. If it worked, the repeal of the medical device tax, which has bipartisan support in the House and Senate, would have been sent to the President's desk long ago. It hasn't. It remains chained up in the Senate leader's office.

My constituents know that I don't run all three branches of government. They know it's not my party in the White House or in control of the Senate. Mr. Speaker, what they do expect is for me to be their voice in Washington, to solve problems, fix government, and put forward solutions.

REOPEN GOVERNMENT TODAY

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, every day that our Federal Government is closed, our economy gets weaker and necessary services that the American people depend upon are not available to them.

But what do we get? Rather than taking up the Senate-passed continuing resolution, we get a series of bills for PR value that are purportedly intended to reopen government, but nobody is fooled. We know that there's no real intent on the part of the other side to reopen government because you don't want to give up your leverage to try to defeat or repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act.

You lost in the House of Representatives. You lost in the Senate. You lost the campaign for the White House on this question. You lost in the Supreme Court. If this were baseball, you hit for the cycle and you lost all four.

We know that if these bills continue to come to us one or two a day, you'll have the Federal Government reopen sometime next spring. Let's do it this afternoon. When we come to this floor, you'll have a chance to vote on a clean CR, if you bring it up.

Let's reopen government today and stop this charade.

□ 1215

SHUTDOWN

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as the oldest Member in the history of this body, I rise with more concern today for our country than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I was a Member when we had the last shutdown. It spawned a balanced budget. Today, unfortunately, we have a President and a Senate who so far are unwilling to negotiate on a budget that will accomplish these same goals.

We need to rein in Federal Government, cut wasteful spending, fix the Tax Code, protect and strengthen Medicare and our national defense, balance the budget, and address the harmful ObamaCare. And now people tell me to continue to object to ObamaCare and don't let up.

The President needs to give the American people the same privileges he's given to big business and small business—a 1-year delay and a mandate on ObamaCare.

The Senate rejected all four negotiation attempts proposed by the House. The result of their refusal? A shutdown of the government. They, with this President, shut this government down.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President and Senator REID to work with us on a responsible budget. We should all work toward the same goal: protect the best possible opportunity for Americans to prosper, the greatest good for the greatest number, our children.

SHUTDOWN

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, the insistence of some to act irresponsibly and shut this government down is disappointing. But more importantly, it is harmful to the American people, to American businesses, and, if prolonged, to the long-term prosperity of our country.

Because of this shutdown, over 800,000 government workers are furloughed and don't know when they will see their next paycheck. In my district, as but one example, 2,500 people at Naval Station Great Lakes, the Navy's only training facility, have been told not to come to work.

Hardworking people around the country have been locked out of their jobs because some in Congress see fit to hold ideology over good governance.

I remind my colleagues that we were sent here to govern and act responsibly—but at this moment, Congress is doing neither.

The businesses, working families, veterans, and seniors in my district and across this country cannot afford for Congress to continue this game. Let's start putting this country on a long-term, fiscally sustainable path forward, and let's do it together.

I am and I always will be committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find a solution to this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, let's end this shutdown today.

THERE WILL BE NO SURRENDER

(Mr. WEBER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 1836, a dictator showed up at the Alamo in Texas and demanded a complete, full surrender without negotiation. William Travis responded with a cannon shot: There will be no surrender.

Now comes the President and the Senate Majority Leader demanding that this House of Representatives surrender. We will not surrender. We are fighting for the American people. Tea partiers knew in the Colonies that King George's dictatorial methods wouldn't be tolerated. We won't tolerate them here.

Like it or not, Mr. President and the Senate Majority Leader, this House is a part of this process. We understand that we are fighting for the American people. We will not surrender. We are going to fight to make sure that we keep our liberty. Americans expect nothing less and deserve nothing less.

I am RANDY WEBER and damn proud to be an American.

SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BARROW of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in my district, thousands of government employees are being forced to work without pay. Thousands more have been laid off. All because Congress can't get its act together long enough to do our most basic job: to keep the government running. They're ready, willing, and able to do their jobs, but can't—because Congress has failed to do its job.

Folks back home ask me: Why do you get paid, but we don't?

We're told that the Constitution requires that Members of Congress get paid, whether or not they do their job. I think that's wrong, and I have introduced legislation to change it. While folks at home don't get paid, I don't think we should get paid.

I'm not talking about asking the Clerk to sit on our checks until after this is over; that's no sacrifice. That's why I'm donating my pay to the Augusta Warrior Project for the duration of the shutdown. I'm giving it to folks who can use it, and I'm calling on all of my colleagues to do the same.

It's about accountability, Mr. Speaker. If Members of Congress didn't get paid for not doing their job, maybe they would appreciate those who do their job a little bit more.

NETWORKS' BIAS SHOWS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the weeks leading up to the government shutdown, ABC, NBC, and CBS tried to make sure that it would be the Republicans who were responsible.

A Media Research Center analysis found that from September 17 through September 30, the networks' evening newscasts ran a total of 39 stories about a possible government shutdown. Of these stories, over half blamed Republicans for the potential shutdown. Not one news report placed the blame on the Democrats.

Yet it is Republicans who have passed such bills as keeping the National Institutes of Health open and making sure that veterans get their benefits. These bills are opposed by the President and the Senate Democrats. Republicans want to reduce the pain of the shutdown for the American people, but they are blocked by those who want the entire government to remain shut down.

Americans deserve a national media that gives them the facts rather than one that is in the pocket of the Democratic Party.

END THE CRISIS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, I stood with hundreds of American workers who came to this place that they consider a place of responsibility and respect—holders of the Constitution—to beg for their jobs. They represent a small segment of 800,000 Federal employees.

As I was standing there, a representative, Ms. McNeill from AFGE, indicated that this morning she had just received a call from an unemployed Federal worker and an unemployed husband, a wife and husband. They're in crisis. The woman is now being abused, and they had to escort her to a shelter—crisis, Mr. Speaker.

It's not about surrendering. It's about caring about the American people. It's about caring about Diane, who was able to get health insurance after being diabetic and hearing bad things about ObamaCare. And it's about Senator Dole and JOHN DINGELL, two World War II veterans who have said: Don't insult us with this piecemeal.

A Republican and the dean of the House want us to stop and put a clean CR for the American people and to end this crisis. I'm here to end the crisis right now.

WASHINGTON DEMOCRATS MUST SUPPORT OUR VETERANS AND GUARD MEMBERS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a bipartisan group of the House passed two commonsense pieces of legislation: first, to provide resources for our Nation's veterans; and, second, to ensure that our men and women in uniform serving in the National Guard and Reserve are able to be compensated for their efforts.

We should all agree that legislation designed to protect our national security should be above partisan politics. Unfortunately, Senate Democrats have rejected the legislation. Additionally, the President has already threatened to veto these bills.

As a 31-year veteran of the National Guard, I hope, for the sake of our brave men and women in uniform and military families, that obstructionism will cease. It is now up to Washington Democrats to put politics aside, do the right thing, and protect our national security by promoting these bills.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Congratulations to our chaplain today, Senate Chaplain Barry Black, for recently being awarded a doctorate from his alma mater, the University of South Carolina.

TURN THE SWITCH ON, MR. SPEAKER

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a dark day today in America and the lights of the greatest government of the greatest democracy in the world are out. The only person who can turn those lights back on, the only person who controls the switch is Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, not the Tea Party.

Turn that switch on, Mr. Speaker. Turn it on for the Federal worker at Camp Parks in Dublin, California, who is seeking unemployment benefits and asking to extend the mortgage on his house. Turn it on for the children who are awaiting clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health. Turn it on for our veterans, whose claims will be delayed. Turn on the lights, Mr. Speaker, for the hungry women and children who will be affected by delayed WIC funding. Turn on the lights for our Capitol Hill Police, who stand guard at the people's House without pay.

Mr. Speaker, you can turn back on the lights of the government that runs the greatest democracy in the world. Just give us a vote.

FUND THE GOVERNMENT

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's time to fund the government.

So far, House Republicans have passed four bills to fully fund the government. Since then, that wasn't enough for the Senate, and they shut the government down.

On a bipartisan basis, we have passed bills to ensure our National Guard and reservists are paid, we're funding Federal benefits, reopening national parks, reopening the National Institutes of Health, and allowing the District of Columbia to expend their own local funds. All of these passed with bipartisan votes.

A clean CR is not the answer. A clean CR funds the gold-plated health care plan for Members of Congress. Members of Congress cannot be treated one way and the American people another way. We need fairness for every American and to stop the chaos of ObamaCare.

It's time for HARRY REID and President Obama to come to the table in good faith to work together with House Republicans for the good of all Americans. Let's pass the bills that we have bipartisan support for today.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, here we are on day 4 of a government shutdown that should never have happened.

I'm deeply disappointed that my Republican colleagues have decided that their obsession with repealing the Affordable Care Act is more important than the rest of the country, more important than 800,000 government workers going without a paycheck, more important than children and families of less means going without the nutritional support they rely on, more important than providing cancer victims and survivors with the reassurance that this government is continuing with critical research to find a cure for cancer.

Why are they letting this shutdown drag on when it could be over today? How much longer do the American people have to suffer?

I urge my colleagues to turn this ship around right now and give us a bill that will fund all of the government without any strings attached, that restores critical services to our seniors, to our veterans, and to our families. Enough already.

PAY OUR GUARDSMEN AND CIVILIAN DEFENSE PERSONNEL ACT

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that I and most of the Members of this House have voted now for five different measures that would have paid our Nation's civilian defense workforce and all of our guardsmen and reservists. The first of

those bills passed this House with overwhelming bipartisan support in July. Mr. Speaker—July. Unfortunately, the Senate and the President have refused to pass four of the five measures.

And in the Pay Our Military Act, the President unilaterally deemed many of the civilian workforce and our National Guard nonessential to our national defense. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but what the President is doing is wrong. The civilian workers that design, build, and maintain our planes, our ships, and our infrastructure and support our warfighters in everything that they do are essential and should not be furloughed simply because the President chooses to do so.

Every member of our National Guard and Reserve stand ready to defend our Nation, and they should be paid while we wait on HARRY REID and the President to agree to negotiate. That's why I've introduced the Pay Our Guardsmen and Civilian Defense Personnel Act. Our national security depends on these men and women, and they should be paid while we're waiting on the President and Senator REID simply to do their job and agree to negotiate with us.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the good people in my Arizona district are disgusted with this Congress. They see Washington treating this shutdown as a political game.

News reports now confirm that there are enough votes in the House—Democrats and Republicans—to pass a clean funding bill and reopen the government right now. Yet the House GOP keeps bringing up piecemeal bills that are going nowhere, designed to create campaign attack fodder.

This week, the House majority cynically used piecemeal votes on veterans and national parks. My district has the Grand Canyon and many national parks; and as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I'm disgusted with these dead-end, piecemeal games. And you know who else is disgusted? Veterans.

Yesterday, the commander in chief of the VFW said:

We expect more from our elected leadership, and not a piecemeal approach that would use the military or disabled veterans as leverage in a political game.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop the piecemeal games and restart our government now.

□ 1230

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that there is plenty to disagree about in Washington, D.C. The House majority continues to believe that funding special treatment for Members of Congress in the Affordable Care Act is wrong. The House majority continues to believe that the American people need a reprieve from the new government insurance mandate for 1 year—the same reprieve that has been given to businesses, unions, Congress, and other groups. We should all be treated equally and fairly under the law, and Congress should have to follow the same laws it dictates to the rest of America.

But as we continue to negotiate over this divide, let's start funding the things we agree on. Let's fund veterans programs. Let's fund the NIH clinical trials. Let's fund Head Start, WIC programs. Let's open up the World War II Memorial. Surely, even in the divided times we live in, we could set aside our differences and start reopening the doors of government. This shutdown is wrong and the American people are hurting.

Let's please start working together, getting past our differences, finding points of agreement, and let's forge ahead together united as Americans.

HEALTH BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THEIR STAFF

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to correct the record regarding the health benefits for Members of Congress and their staff.

Recently, many on the other side have been falsely claiming that Congress is trying to exempt itself from the Affordable Care Act in an effort to distract the public from their failure to do their job and keep our government open. The fact is that Members of Congress and their staff are the only people who are required by law to give up current employer-provided health care and go into the exchanges.

I support this because I know the exchanges will provide all Americans, including Congress and its staff, quality, affordable health insurance. The exemption my friends want to get rid of is ending Congress' employer contribution, which all Federal employees currently receive.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues probably have, like many of us do, young staffers working in their offices that make around \$25,000 a year. We are going to ask these devoted civil servants to pay \$5,000 to \$12,000 more per year for health insurance than they currently pay just to score a cheap political point?

Ask the Speaker. He supports maintaining this contribution. Case closed.

MANUFACTURING DAY

(Mr. BENTIVOLIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Manufacturing Day.

America is an exceptional Nation. Over the last 2¼ centuries, our country has been an example of freedom. Our Founders' belief in the free enterprise system helped ignite a transformation in manufacturing that has changed the world.

However, as we all know, arbitrary regulations and excessive taxation unfairly punishes hardworking Americans and impedes our industrial capability. This hurts our national strength and is simply unfair to our manufacturers, especially in the aftermath of a recession, whose effects still linger to this day.

I am proud to represent the second-highest manufacturing district in the country. Every day, I hear from Michiganders who share these concerns with me. Instead of unnecessarily exerting its influence on the economy, the government should promote conditions that make it conducive to invest and grow our economy.

As I always say: "Investment always goes where it is welcome and stays where it is appreciated." The goal of tax reform should be to grow the economy. If we want businesses, especially manufacturing businesses, to grow and create jobs, fixing depreciation rules by moving closer to full expensing would be a great start.

END THIS GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I remain appalled by the gimmicks that the House continues today.

The majority claims that the bills before us will fund WIC and FEMA programs. But let's be clear. The only way these programs will be funded is by ending this irresponsible and reckless government shutdown.

I have no doubt that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle want FEMA to function and WIC recipients to continue to receive life-sustaining nutritional benefits. But to put bills on the floor that pretend to take care of these issues when they do not, or to take care of the American people when they do not, is shameful. We should not be using FEMA and critical safety net programs as political footballs.

Mr. Speaker, if we truly want to end this shutdown and help American families, we must allow a vote on the floor to end this government shutdown. Let us do what we all know is right.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THE SENATE, AND THE PRESIDENT MUST SIT DOWN AND TALK

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, we can continue to march ourselves down here and throw barbs and insults at one another while watching our meager approval rating fall from 10 percent to perhaps 5 percent. We can continue to do that. Or maybe we can re-frame this whole discussion and agree to something—that we should keep working steadily to get this government back running while also working on the right type of policy reform, tax reform, and spending reform that could restore America's greatness.

Now, in the midst of this difficulty, and seemingly with no way out, this could actually be an historic moment. But it will take the House of Representatives and the President of the United States and the United States Senate talking to one another. That conversation must begin now.

BRING A CLEAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION TO THE FLOOR

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, our democracy is supposed to be the example for the world. But the example we have set with this Republican government shutdown is beyond shameful.

Some of my Republican colleagues are actually celebrating this shutdown, saying: "This is exactly what they wanted." Who are they listening to? It certainly isn't the American people.

I fear the survivors of Hurricane Sandy, who have lost everything, will be left without the relief they need. That the 31,000 Federal workers in New Jersey on furlough will wonder how they will make ends meet. I worry about the veterans who have fought for this country but have come home to broken promises. And the more than 9 million women, infants, and children who will be cut from WIC, the nutritional assistance they need to survive.

We cannot choose winners and losers in this fight. I urge my Republican colleagues to act responsibly. Bring a clean CR to the floor and let's start working for the American people again, because they shouldn't have to suffer for the Republicans' inability to govern any longer.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against this unnecessary Republican-led government shutdown.

Republicans should work with Democrats to keep our government open. Republicans have cut off basic government services relied upon by millions of Americans, including millions of Americans who call themselves Republicans.

This effort to shut down our government is costing hardworking taxpayers

millions of dollars. 800,000 Federal employees around the country didn't go to work this week and will not return to work until Republicans end this senseless shutdown.

Instead of working across the aisle, Republicans would rather score political points by the Tea Party. They would rather take our government hostage over an issue that was voted on in March of 2010, upheld by the Supreme Court in June of 2012, and held to a public referendum by the reelection of President Obama in November of 2012.

The Affordable Care Act is law. It has gone through the checks and balances of our government and should not be an issue when it comes to funding our government.

I ask my Republican colleagues to let us return to reason. Let's keep our government running. Let's do the right thing. Stop these games, stop the obstruction, and let's get back to work on real issues.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, this week, a Republican colleague spoke of the need to shut down the government. He said: "We just want to help Americans get past one of the most insidious laws ever created by man." He was referring to the Affordable Care Act, but his words sounded eerily familiar to statements from this body's past.

A Congressman once said:

Never in the history of the world has any measure been brought here so insidiously designed as to prevent business recovery—to enslave workers.

Another one said:

We cannot stand idly by now as the Nation embarks on an ill-conceived adventure in government medicine, from which the patient will be the ultimate sufferer.

These aren't quotes about the Affordable Care Act. The quotes are from Congressman Taber in 1935, opposing Social Security, and from Congressman Hall in 1965, opposing Medicare.

What if opponents of Social Security and Medicare shut down the entire government because they didn't get their way? What if the majorities gave into the demands of those on the wrong side of history? This country would be very different today.

These may be forgotten, but this reckless shutdown will not be, and the American people will remember who caused it.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 371 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 371

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any joint resolution specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such joint resolution are waived. Each such joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The joint resolutions referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(b) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(c) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 77) making continuing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(d) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 78) making continuing appropriations for national intelligence program operations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(e) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) making continuing appropriations for certain components of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(f) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 80) making continuing appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(g) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 82) making continuing appropriations for the National Weather Service for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(h) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 83) making continuing appropriations for the Impact Aid program of the Department of Education for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(i) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) making continuing appropriations for Head Start for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

(j) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 85) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the

bill (H.R. 3223) to provide for the compensation of furloughed Federal employees. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of October 21, 2013.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of October 20, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1245

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentlelady from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for the consideration of 10 different joint resolutions, all of which demonstrate House Republicans' continuing commitment to reopen necessary portions of our government.

The rule is a closed rule, which provides for 40 minutes of debate between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations for each joint resolution. Additionally, the rule provides for 40 minutes of debate between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit for each bill or joint resolution.

Additionally, the rule extends same-day authority for resolutions reported by the Rules Committee through the legislative day of October 21, 2013, thus continuing to allow the House the flexibility to continue to address the government shutdown. Finally, the rule permits the Speaker to entertain

motions to suspend the rules until October 20.

Here we are again, Mr. Speaker—day four of a government shutdown. Unfortunately for the American people, not much has changed. The Senate is still recalcitrant, unwilling to consider legislation that would reopen parts of the government. I do want to add an exception, though, and thank our friends in the upper Chamber for actually agreeing with us to exempt our military from these cuts, both civilian and uniform. The Senate, however, is still unwilling to go to conference to discuss the very serious fiscal issues facing this country. The Senate is also unwilling to consider any of the five pieces of legislation the House passed in the last 2 days, which will reopen parts of our government. Even so, House Republicans continue to bring legislation to the floor to meet the needs of American citizens.

Today's rule will allow for the consideration of resolutions that reopen the Bureau of Indian Education, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, the WIC program, the National Weather Center, FEMA, our intelligence agencies, Impact Aid, Head Start—and the list goes on and on.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this rule makes clear our commitment to the 800,000 Federal workers currently furloughed that they will, indeed, be paid. It is not their fault that Washington is dysfunctional in that Congress can't agree on the size and scope of government. Yet they are caught in the crossfire, wondering if they will be able to afford their mortgages and pay their utility bills. Mr. Speaker, that simply isn't fair. H.R. 3223, of which I am a proud cosponsor, would codify what we have done in every previous government shutdown: pay our Federal employees from the date on which the government shut down.

I particularly want to compliment in a bipartisan fashion our friends Mr. MORAN and Mr. WOLF, who worked together on this measure, who brought it forward and gathered many dozens of cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. Quite frankly, I think their example of bipartisanship and working together is something that we could all learn from.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans alike agree that that's the responsible thing to do. House Republicans are working to deal with the real-world problems of our constituents. Republicans are working to reopen the government. However, we lack a willing partner in the Senate and in the President. Every time we have attempted to negotiate with them, they have told us to accept their plan. They have even rebuffed our attempts to go to conference. Therefore, House Republicans have been left with little choice except that of passing a number of smaller bills to see if the Senate would be willing to accept those. Again, I remark on one occasion, with respect to the military, that they

did, indeed, accept one, so I would urge them to do that with the others.

I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Unless the silent Members of the majority speak up, today's debate is a fait accompli.

For the last 2 days, Members of the majority have said publicly that they wish this government shutdown would end. In fact, a coalition of more than 218 Democrats and Republicans has publicly declared that it is ready to vote on the clean Senate CR. This 218 would be the majority, and we would pass it; and that's why the powerful minority, who has taken the government hostage, is doing all it can again today to prevent the Senate CR from coming to the House floor. It doesn't make any sense. Not only doesn't it make any sense; but, actually, were we to do that, we wouldn't have to be here today, trying to do these piecemeal pieces.

Last night, the Rules Committee proposed a rule for these 11 piecemeal funding bills before us today. They didn't go through a single meeting of a committee. At least, in the committee process, the subcommittees and committees would have given both Republicans and Democrats an opportunity to weigh in on these measures. Remember that half the population of the United States is represented by Democrats and that, in the last election, Democrat candidates for Congress achieved a million more votes than our Republican friends, but we are shut out of the process. Indeed, these bills were written yesterday afternoon and were brought straight to the Rules Committee, as so many are lately, in order to be rushed to the floor.

During our hearing, a colleague promised that the reckless approach would continue, even suggesting that we could see 150 more of these piecemeal bills before the majority agrees to end the government shutdown. That should take us to, maybe, October of next year. Yet, while they're willing to take 150 votes on bills the President would veto—and everybody knows the President would veto them—and the Senate would reject, they haven't allowed a single vote on the cure to the problem: bring up the CR, and put the government back to work.

Fortunately for the American people, no minority—no matter how powerful—can stop the will of the House if we exercise it. Unlike the Senate, a majority in the House can only be held back for so long. Thanks to the democratic spirit baked into our Chamber's rules, the majority will always succeed. For the more than 218 Members—a majority who has expressed a desire to vote on the clean CR—our most powerful tool is voting down the previous question and bringing the clean Senate CR to the floor to vote on.

Now, earlier this week, my Democrat colleagues and I urged the Chamber to vote "no" on the previous question so that we could bring the Senate bill to the floor. Not a single Republican joined our cause. Today, we are going to give you another chance. Following the debate on the rule, we will have a chance to vote down the previous question. While that may simply be legislative language to most people, what that will do is give us an opportunity—those of us who very strongly believe this government should work—to bring the CR, bring the shutdown to a close and put everybody back to work. I want to see by the end of this day that we can accomplish that, because words are no longer enough. Those Members of the majority who claim that they want to end the government shutdown get the opportunity today to stand up and vote. As I said the other day when we had the same opportunity, I would like them to put their voting cards where their mouths are.

Over the next hour, I encourage every Member of this Chamber to reflect on the damage that has already been wrought on our Nation because of the shutdown and on the damage that will ensue if we wait another day. The shutdown is costing the Nation \$300 million a day, and more than 800,000 workers are furloughed without pay. Today, we are going to vote—and, I think, almost unanimously—to pay them when the shutdown ends. A logical person would say, Why don't you bring them back to work? If they're going to be paid anyway, let them work. There is no answer for that. There must be some reason here that is available to only a few people as to why the majority wants to keep the government shut down.

We have to also end this because our State Department and intelligence employees need to go back on the job. A hurricane is bearing down right now on the State of Louisiana while 80 percent of the FEMA workers are furloughed. NASA had to turn off the Mars Rover, which was giving us so much information about the universe—stopping all the space exploration in its tracks.

I think one of the best things I've read to describe what we are doing in this House was said by a Republican. Because there is no plan here—there is no end game here—he is saying that what they are doing is laying the track ahead of the speeding train as it bears down on them.

The majority started the shutdown because they were dead set on repealing the Affordable Care Act; and I think, by doing this piecemeal, they think they can still do that. Throughout the process, they have issued dire predictions about the health care law and have warned that the law would hurt American workers. It is absolutely turning out not to be true.

In the last week, two of our Nation's biggest companies have responded to the Affordable Care Act by giving tens of thousands of their part-time employ-

ees full-time jobs. Guess who they are? One is the largest employer in the United States—Walmart. They are raising 35,000 of their part-time employees to become full-time employees in order to make them eligible for health insurance. Walt Disney announced that 427 employees at Disney World who have been hired as full-time employees will be given access to the health insurance plan. We also hear all the time—and I've really got to research this—that Delta Air Lines has said, they tell me, that the affordable care plan would cost them \$100 million a year. I surely would like to know how that's possible unless they plan to hire 70 million new employees, which would certainly be good for employment, but I see no earthly reason for them to do that. We need to know whether that's true or not since all of the rest of the dire predictions have turned out not to be.

The Affordable Care Act is working; but because of the majority, the government is not, and it's time for the majority to give up this losing game. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the underlying legislation; and, so importantly, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question. Then, Mr. Speaker, we can bring the clean Senate CR to the House floor, as we should have done weeks ago, and end this government shutdown today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address a couple of points that my good friend raises; but before I do, I want to agree with her in that I think we all think the government ought to be open. I, actually, don't think there is much division about that, and folks have actually tried to do that. On our side of the aisle, every single piece of legislation we've brought to the floor during this period has either kept the government open in whole or in part, and I suspect we will continue to try and do that. So it's not the aim of either side here to shut down the government.

In terms of the Affordable Health Care Act, I certainly don't support it—I voted against it, and voted multiple times to repeal it and delay it—but I'll agree with my good friend on that, too, in the sense that there are times when we have actually worked together on both sides of the aisle to change it. My friends like to quite often mention there have been 41 or 42 efforts to repeal, delay, defund the bill; but they usually forget to add—and, quite frankly, some people on our side of the aisle forget to add—that seven of those have actually succeeded, that is, a Democratic Senate and a Democratic President agreed with them.

The proposals that we have on the table now in terms of the Affordable Health Care Act are immanently sensible and overwhelmingly popular. To put it quite simply, we just don't think that political appointees and elected officials ought to be treated differently

than other Americans. Now, we can get into a big fight about health care; but the reality is, right now, under the law, Members of Congress and their staffs can bring subsidies with them onto the exchange. No other American can do that. We can do this either way as far as I'm concerned. I could leave them back as Federal employees, and they could be treated like every other Federal employee—that's the acceptable solution to me at least—or we could allow other Americans to bring subsidies onto the exchange just like Members of Congress; but the underlying principle is that we ought to treat them all the same. Washington political appointees shouldn't be treated differently than the average American.

The second thing is, I think, very simple. We're not talking about delaying all of ObamaCare; but if we are going to allow big businesses to wait a year before they implement what they're required to do—if we are going to allow 1,100 organizations and many labor unions to do it—why shouldn't we allow the average American, at his choice, to delay it as well?

□ 1300

They don't want to delay. They can go onto the exchanges. The subsidies are still there. The tax programs are still there. Why shouldn't the average American have the same privilege that we've bestowed on Big Business, Big Labor, and countless organizations? That's what we're talking about.

To my friend's point here—and I suspect this is true of the debt ceiling a little bit further down the road—the Democratic approach is very simple: do everything I want, and then I'm willing to negotiate. We would like to sit down and talk now and see if we could find some common ground. We've got negotiators, conferees—the technical title—available to sit down and find common ground. We're not asking for something that is unreasonable, in my view. We're certainly not proposing something that is outside the scope of the type of things we've been able to agree on before.

The President, I want to add, is taking the same approach that the Senate has taken with regard to the continuing resolution with the debt ceiling. He has just simply said we have to raise it unilaterally. That's not a particularly popular vote, probably on either side of the aisle. It's certainly not on my side of the aisle.

I'm willing to work with the President on the debt ceiling. I did it in 2011. And I want to note for the record, that is something he never did when he was a Member of the United States Senate. He didn't vote to raise the debt ceiling when he had the opportunity to do it. Instead, he engaged in a lecture about debt. It probably was a lecture that was needed. Regardless, he did not do for George Bush what he's asking us to do for him.

I'm willing to do that. I'm willing to work with him on the debt ceiling. If

you voted for the Ryan budget, you envisioned the debt ceiling as being something that has to be raised while you deal with the underlying deficit. I do want to do something or be in a negotiation with the President about what to do on that deficit. I don't think that's an unreasonable position.

I think the real central issue in this is not the Affordable Care Act, not the debt ceiling, and, frankly, not even the government shutdown, as serious as that is. The real issue is whether my friends and the President of the United States will simply come to the table to negotiate. Will they put a counterproposal out there, or is it simply going to be: We insist in getting our way, in full, all the time? I don't think that's an acceptable way to arrive at common ground, and I don't think it's likely to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm so pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), our incredible member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the distinguished ranking member for the time.

Mr. Speaker, here we are on day 4 of the Republican shutdown of the people's government.

The other day after meeting with the President at the White House, Speaker BOEHNER said:

At some point, we've got to allow the process that our Founders gave us to work out.

Mr. Speaker, I've studied American history, too, and what the Republican leadership is doing with this rule is a million miles away from what the Founders had in mind.

I'm comforted that Speaker BOEHNER has said privately that he wants to extend the debt ceiling. He also said he didn't want to shut down the government, yet here we are. I don't know what Senator CRUZ is saying privately, which is important, because he's apparently calling all the shots around here.

The rule before us today extends martial law rule until October 21. They have decided that they have the right to throw the rules and traditions of this House into the trash can for the next 2½ weeks. That's 4 days after we default on our obligations. That should make all of us very nervous.

The rule also makes in order 11 separate bills—many of which were never considered in committee or on the House floor—under a closed process with no amendments. I've been on and around the Rules Committee for quite a few years, Mr. Speaker, but I have never seen a rule like this.

I find it astounding that the Republicans have suddenly found religion on the need to go to conference on the budget, because for months and months and months and months they have refused to appoint budget negotiators. Suddenly, as the American people rise up in outrage over their tactics and their poll numbers fall off a cliff, my Republican friends all of the sudden now want to negotiate.

There's a very easy way to get past this: bring up the short-term clean continuing resolution that has already passed the Senate—at Republican sequester numbers, no less—and we will pass it with a bipartisan vote and end this unnecessary, harmful Republican shutdown. It is simple.

Mr. Speaker, not only is this process awful, so are many of the bills made in order under this rule. I want to talk about one in particular, the one that provides funding for WIC, the Women, Infants, and Children Nutrition Program. After months of trying to cut \$40 billion from the SNAP program, after months of demonizing poor people, after months of trying to slash food assistance programs across the board, Republicans would like us all to believe that they care about hunger in America all of the sudden.

Give me a break. Give me a break, Mr. Speaker. I say to my Republican friends: Where have you been? Where have you been on this issue?

Because of the sequester, we've already seen WIC clinics close and participation in the program fall. That means that fewer and fewer low-income women and children are getting help, the nutritious food that they need. This bill does not fix that.

The National WIC Association urges the House to oppose H.J. Res. 75, calling it "a cynical ploy to use low-income, nutritionally at-risk mothers and young children as political pawns for political ends." They are right, Mr. Speaker, this is a cynical ploy.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule, pass the clean CR, and let the American people get on with their lives.

I would say to the Speaker of the House that all you need to do is schedule a vote. You don't even have to vote for it. If you schedule it, it will pass in a bipartisan manner and we can end this shutdown once and for all.

Please, Mr. Speaker, practice a little democracy in the people's House. Please, Mr. Speaker, give us a vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just a quick point. My friend is always quite eloquent, and I know, frankly, very passionate and very well-meaning and very expert when he talks about nutrition programs, where he spent a great deal of time.

For the record, it's worth noting that we have increased nutrition programs broadly by 400 percent since George Bush became President. We doubled them, roughly, when Bush was President. Doubled them again since President Obama has been in office. What the Republican program is talking about is a 5 percent cut after a 400 percent increase based on reforms. I think it's maybe not quite so dire.

Again, I recognize my friend's good work in this area and hope that we have an opportunity to get to conference, have that discussion. I suspect the bill, if it comes back, may be closer to his liking than the bill that went out.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My objection with the Republican approach to the SNAP program is that 3.8 million people will lose their benefits, 170,000 veterans would lose their benefits, and we have a problem with hunger in America. We have close to 50 million people who are hungry, and 17 million are kids. We should all be ashamed of that. We should be coming together to solve the problem and not making it worse. That's where my frustration comes from.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, the rolls have been going up in a period we're supposed to be recovering. I think we have some genuine problems in this program in terms of reform. Again, that's the initial proposal. It's not out of bounds considering a 400 percent increase to have a 5 percent cut-back. We'll wait and see what comes out of the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member of the Rules Committee for yielding, and I thank Ms. SLAUGHTER for the extraordinary leadership she has shown and the work she has been doing.

Mr. Speaker, the people want their government open. A government of the people and for the people and by the people ought to be open. They want their dedicated Federal employees, who have been unfairly furloughed, to go back to work. They want to end the shutdown that is having negative consequences for our economy and for our national security and for the confidence of Americans that their government can work.

The only way to do so is by passing a clean, get-the-government-open funding bill to keep the government open while we discuss, negotiate, put forward our positions, a longer term agreement on the budget.

The Senate has acted, and acted responsibly, by passing a bill that will keep the government operating. They passed that bill with a number that was suggested by the Republican Party, Mr. Speaker. Now we have the opportunity to do the same thing right now and end this shutdown. Get the people's government back to work.

There are a growing number of Republicans who say they would vote for a bill which is so-called "clean," not with any of the poison pills that have been on it time after time after time. I tell them that this is your opportunity to back up your words with actions. Don't just say, "Let's end the shutdown." Vote with us in just a few minutes to end the shutdown.

On Wednesday, Majority Leader CANTOR said this:

We're trying to get this government open as quickly as possible.

"As quickly as possible" is in about 5, 10, 15, or 20 minutes. That's "as quickly as possible." I don't know if it's as quickly as probable, because I'm not sure that the majority leader means those words or that his party means those words, but we're going to have an opportunity to vote on it.

I say to my friend from Virginia, here is our chance to do so. To the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), Mr. COLE's colleague, who said about the shutdown that he and his Republican colleagues have imposed: I would like to end it this afternoon; I say we can do it—he's right. In just a few minutes, Mr. LANKFORD is going to have the opportunity to vote that way. It's either empty rhetoric, or he means what he says.

Let's do it. Let's open government. Let's get the people's public servants back to work for them. Right here, right now, we can end this shutdown today, this afternoon, in just a few minutes.

We don't differ. As I understand it, everybody on both sides of the aisle says they don't want to shut down government. Mr. COLE says that. Ms. SLAUGHTER says that. I say that. We have the power, in a few minutes, to put people back to work for all of our constituents.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion—the previous question, we call it, jargon for saying "let's move on." If we vote "no" on the previous question, we can put a bill on the floor which will put the government back to work this afternoon. Mr. COLE knows we can do that. I don't know that Mr. COLE will vote to do that. I think Ms. SLAUGHTER will vote to do that. I will vote to do that. Mr. ANDREWS will vote to do that. Others will vote to do that. If they do, if they match their actions with their talk, then we can open this government in just a matter of minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee.

□ 1315

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from the Rules Committee for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to what my friend, the minority whip, just said. He said, There are things that we agree on, why can't we get those things done? I would say that every single Member that the majority whip pointed out that said, I know they're going to vote for that, I know they're going to vote for that, I know they're going to vote for that—we have an opportunity today to vote to reopen parts of the Department of Homeland Security. I know we agree on that. Let's do that. We have the opportunity under this rule to go ahead and fund the WIC program. I know we agree on that. Let's do that.

I didn't come to that conclusion on my own, Mr. Speaker. I sit in the Rules Committee, and I listen to my colleagues. This happens to be a statement from the minority whip in a Rules Committee hearing. He said this: "The American people are obviously deeply distressed. They are distressed that when they see agreement, that that agreement is not made into law. We don't have an agreement on everything, but we do have an agreement. Let's move forward on that which we agree."

I agree. Every single provision that we are bringing to the floor today, I say, Mr. Speaker, is something on which we agree.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman used my name. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield if I have time remaining. The gentleman knows I would be happy to yield, and I absolutely will.

Let us move forward on that with which we agree. There is not one provision in this rule on which we disagree. And Mr. Speaker, you will not hear anyone on this floor say otherwise.

But it's not just the minority whip, who I would very much like to yield to if I have time remaining; it's the minority leader. The same Rules Committee hearing: "Here is a place where we are all in agreement. Whatever else we have, we can continue that conversation later."

"We can continue that conversation later." Let's do what we all agree on.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I agree with my friend, the minority whip. I agree with the minority leader.

As I have said to my friend very respectfully, if I have time remaining at the end, I would be happy to yield. But at the moment, I do not. Very respectfully to my friend.

And it's not just my friend, the minority whip. It's not just the minority leader. It's President Barack Obama: "I want the American people to urge Congress soon to begin the work we have by doing what we all agree on. We already all agree on making sure middle class taxes don't go up. So let's get that done."

We did. Now some Republicans voted "no," and some Democrats voted "no." But the Chamber came together, and we got that done. We're in the same place today, Mr. Speaker.

If one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle disagrees with any one of these provisions is not worthy of their vote, if they do not affirmatively want to see these programs reopen, I would like to hear that from my friends. But Mr. Speaker, they do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend for yielding.

I now yield to my friend from Maryland, the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman believe that we should shut down the government?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I will say to my friend, I spent the entire month of August at every town hall meeting I could find, telling folks that government shutdowns were not the right plan for this Nation.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for continuing to yield.

Then we agree not only on the small slices of which the gentleman has spoken and would draw on the floor today but on the whole. And we could put every employee back to work for the American people today because, as you say, we agree.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that, no, we do not agree because the gentleman wants to continue to support those programs that are putting workers in my district out of work. They want to continue to support those programs that are taking health insurance away from families in my district. They want to continue to support those programs that we know are broken.

Folks, my constituency wants to do away with preexisting conditions. My constituency wants to ensure that every child has access to health coverage. But my constituency does not understand why we had to re-regulate the entire health care industry, destroying the 40-hour workweek, as my union friends have said, destroying quality health care plans that folks in my district have had but have now lost, breaking the promise the President made that if you like your health insurance, you can keep it. There's not a man or woman in this room that believes that promise has been kept. We were duped, Mr. Speaker, by that promise.

Today, however, we have straightforward, narrow bills. Not 2,400 pages of legislation, Mr. Speaker, but one idea at a time. Stand up, Mr. Speaker. Who doesn't believe that the Department of Homeland Security, focused on our Nation's security, should be funded? Stand up, and vote "no." But you believe that it should be, and you're going to vote "no" anyway.

Who doesn't believe that the Impact Aid Program from the Department of Education which helps children not just in my district but in every district, Mr. Speaker, who doesn't believe that ought to be funded? The truth is, everyone believes that ought to be funded. And yet they are going to stand up today and vote "no" anyway. They are encouraged to vote "no" by leadership. It's disappointing to me, Mr. Speaker.

I'm disappointed we can't agree on everything, but I recognize that we can't. I know that we agree on most things. Let's do those things on which we agree. Don't take my word for it.

Take President Obama's word for it. Let's begin the work we have by doing what we all agree on. Take NANCY PELOSI's word for it—let's do what we all agree on. We can continue the rest of that conversation later. Let's do what my good friend, the minority whip, who just left the floor, said: We don't have an agreement on everything, but we do have an agreement. Let's move forward on that with which we agree. I could not agree more, Mr. Speaker.

I urge a strong "yes" vote for this rule and a strong "yes" vote for every single underlying provision.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

My colleagues have confused the fact that they have gone around saying how, indeed, throughout August and all the rest of this time, that they don't want to shut down the House, in some hope, I guess, that nobody would understand that when they shut down the House, that they had actually done it.

Now what my colleague is talking about from the Democrat side, what they are saying, let's do what we agree with, they are taking their word for it that you didn't want to shut down the House. So let's not do it. You cannot superimpose that notion onto the idea of setting up this government by dribs and drabs. None of us are for that. The Senate won't do it. You know this is an exercise in futility. But pretty soon, the previous question is coming up. You are going to have a chance to do what you said you didn't want to do, shut down the House. But I understand from what you have said that because of health care, because of health care and what you think it has done to people in your district, you are holding this country hostage.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I don't have the time. My time has been given out.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair tell me how much time the gentlewoman from New York has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from the great State of Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, we are here on a Friday. The government has partially been shut down for some 4 days now.

Republicans have tried to be reasonable. Many of us did not like ObamaCare. Some folks, like myself—my family didn't have health care at certain times. And I thought we had a responsibility to help people who had preexisting conditions, help some of our young people. And we disagreed with the other side. They passed it. They said you'd know what was in the bill after we passed it. After we passed it, and it became the law, we saw what

was in it. The President, some 17 times now—many times in contravention of the law that was passed—changed the law.

Now when we came a few days ago, October 1, there wasn't money to run the government, but there was money to run ObamaCare. Still, many people were left in the lurch after many exceptions were made for special interest folks, even business. And I admit to being pro-business. They gave them a waiver.

We said that Members of Congress and also the White House staff and others should be under ObamaCare, and we said that the individual should also have a break here.

This is a system that some Democrats said was a train wreck. We didn't say that. But we should have the opportunity to make some changes. And we offered three opportunities to make changes—some of them minor—that we thought were fair.

But when you go out golfing the Saturday before the government is about to run out of money, when you don't show up for work on Sunday, and you come to work on Monday, as the United States Senate did, you can't negotiate. When you send people to the White House and sit there and say, we won't negotiate—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. I yield my friend from Florida an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MICA. But our leaders, in good faith, went to the White House.

As a staffer, I used to get calls. I was a staffer for Senator Hawkins, and Ronald Reagan would ask me to help work with my boss and others to get things done.

I voted on this floor to impeach Bill Clinton. And Bill Clinton came back and worked with us. We balanced the budget.

Remember, after we had the last shutdown, '95, within 2 years, we balanced the budget. We reformed welfare. We balanced the budget. Actually, the debate here on September 11, just before September 11, was what to do with the surplus. So some good can come out of this, good people working together.

But when they won't negotiate, when they call you to the White House and they won't talk, when they go to Maryland, as they did, or wherever it was in the region here, and then tell folks that we're holding a gun to their heads, that's wrong.

Let's negotiate. Let's get this done for the American people.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am feeling quite badly. I didn't know how much time I had remaining.

I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), if he would like.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

I oppose this rule, and I oppose the bill. I don't oppose it because my district does not need the assistance. I represent one of the most impoverished and disadvantaged districts in America. We have great need. Fortunately, many of my constituents know the difference between genuinely trying to help them or, as the guys in the barber shop might say, "gaming them." Or they may say, "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me." Or they could say that this piecemeal approach is not going to cut it.

Poverty in my State of Illinois is at nearly 15 percent. And in my district, child poverty is 40 percent. Women, 28 percent; African Americans, 38 percent. Twenty-three percent of Asian Americans and 24 percent of Latinos in my district live in poverty. Overall, 196,478 people in my district live in poverty.

So you can see we need the assistance. But we also need affordable health care. We need LIHEAP. We need mortgage assistance. We need to get homeless people off the street during Chicago's cold winters. Therefore, I cannot support this piecemeal approach. What we need is a clean CR so that our employees can return to work and our people can receive the services and benefits that they so greatly need and rightly deserve. We need a clean CR.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Kentucky, the Honorable HAL ROGERS, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Might I engage in a colloquy with the gentleman?

Mr. COLE. Certainly.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. What is the normal time-honored procedure in the Congress when the two bodies disagree?

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, we schedule a conference, we go to conference, and we try to negotiate our differences.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That's the time-honored tradition. That's the way the place works. It's the way it should operate. That's regular order.

Now the Senate has passed the bill. The House has passed a bill, which disagree with each other. The House, two or three nights ago now, passed their motion to go to conference, and it passed the House. The Speaker of the House then appointed conferees from the House side and sent that to the Senate, waiting for the Senate to appoint conferees so that we can meet together, work out our differences, and bring that agreement back to each body, the House and the Senate.

□ 1330

Why aren't we proceeding on regular order in this case?

Do you have an answer?

Mr. COLE. If the gentleman will yield, no, Mr. Chairman, I do not. I

would just highly recommend to my friends we do, since it seems to be a good way to resolve our differences.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Reclaiming my time, that's the way we've done it for 200 years or so, and that is, when we disagree with the other body, we each appoint our conferees. The conferees go off and haggle and amend and argue and debate until there's some agreement that can be brought back to each Chamber, which then can reject or accept that conference report.

The House has acted. We're waiting on the Senate to appoint their conferees so that we can go off and work, 24 hours a day, if necessary, to come to an agreement, which we can do.

And I would urge the other body to honor the age-old tradition in the Congress. When you disagree with the other body, you appoint conferees to work out the differences, bring it back to each body, and I would hope that the Senate would do that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that regular order has not been the order of business in this House for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. This process is about appropriations. That's how we keep government open.

Unfortunately, we've never been able to get any of the appropriation bills to the floor because the Republicans won't appoint conferees to the joint committees, so we're doing a continuing resolution.

The continuing resolution is not new in this Congress. It's been done every year. The shocking thing is it's never been used as a weapon of destruction until now. We were here last year, same argument.

The health care bill is not the issue here. That's been law in this country for 3½ years. So for 3½ years, we've been appropriating money to keep government open.

What's the difference now?

The difference now is a new attitude, new breed, very mean, very conservative, very anti-government; and they're willing to bring their internal kind of power within their caucus to shut down the whole country, if not the whole world. It's totally irresponsible.

They argue, well, we can do this if we could change the health care. If the health care bill needs changing, bring it up in a bill. That's how we change things.

So I'm opposing this rule because this rule says, okay, let's bring up 10 parts of government. Let's bring up 10 parts. Let's just have multiple choice. Let's have a triage.

Which parts of government do you like?

I'd like to compliment my colleague, Mr. COLE, because in it we can't be

against all health care because we keep open, in one of these bills, H.J. Res. 80, the Indian Health Services, so obviously we're going to provide health services for some low-income people; but we're against any other system that might provide assistance for other kinds of low-income people.

So this is government by multiple choice. It's not working. That's why we oppose it. Let's bring the whole family, the whole Nation together.

Reject this rule. Defeat the previous question and defeat the rule, and get on with a CR that is in this House and can be voted on right now.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe I've only got one more speaker in the room, so I wanted to inform my colleague that, after Mr. ANDREWS, I may be prepared to close.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for the time.

Mr. Speaker, there's been an avalanche of talk from both sides, an avalanche of opinion. That's democracy.

I think there is one indisputable fact, and that is the one way to end the government shutdown today is for the House to pass the Senate bill and send it to the President. That would end the shutdown immediately.

Now, it's my opinion that a majority of Members of the House would vote in favor of that proposal if it reaches the floor. I think that's what would happen.

But it's my conviction, and I think it should be our shared conviction, that we ought to take a vote on it. We ought to let all 433 Members that are present here cast a vote on whether they want the Senate bill to pass or not; and if our side wins, fine. If our side loses, that's fine too. That's democracy.

After this avalanche of talk, there is going to be a chance, in a few minutes, for people to actually vote on this question; and this is not the technical, procedural language, but it's the reality language.

What this vote's really going to ask is this: Do you want the government shutdown to continue or not?

If you vote "no" that you don't want the government shutdown to continue, the Senate bill will come to the House floor this afternoon, and we'll take that vote.

If you vote "yes," then the Senate bill will not come to the House floor, and we'll continue on this everlasting process of burdening the American people, talking the issue to death, and not getting anything done.

I think we owe it to the American people to all stand up and raise our hands, either say "yes" or "no" on the Senate bill. If your answer is "no," your answer is "no." Mine would be "yes."

But the way to make that happen is to cast this vote in a few minutes. The question on this vote is, Do you want the government shutdown to continue or not?

If your vote is “no,” then we vote on the Senate bill. If your vote is “yes,” then we don’t, and the shutdown continues.

The American people deserve this vote.

Mr. Speaker, give us this vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I have some good news I want to announce here just shortly.

But I want to note, for the record, my friends quite often make the point that they don’t like a piecemeal approach. The reality is, if you look at actions, sometimes they do. They like it until they don’t.

I would point out we had, of course, H.R. 3210 here, which funded the military, by our good friend from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN). I think, in a very bipartisan way, we voted overwhelmingly on both sides to fund the military and most of the contracting and civilian employees.

There is a little disagreement with the administration about that right now, but that’s half the discretionary budget taken care of in a “piecemeal approach.”

Today the administration just announced, and I commend them for doing it, and I commend my friend because she announced she was going to be supportive of this too, and I think we all are. It was very evident in the Rules Committee, H.R. 3223, the Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act.

The administration’s just announced that they’re going to support that legislation. The President looks forward to signing it, and that’s a bipartisan agreement between both sides and, frankly, a product of the work of our mutual good friends, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who found common ground and, in a piecemeal approach, moved us closer to a solution.

So I think that’s maybe not the greatest news in the world, but on a day where there’s not as much good as we would all like, some good news. And I would hope my friends would look at the individual pieces of legislation that are coming, where we mostly agree, and accept those.

We don’t have to agree on everything, as the point’s been made by several, to agree on some things. Those are areas that we do agree. And if we can fund our military in this fashion, and if we can make sure that our Federal employees are not going to lose any pay, retroactively, certainly, one step at a time, we can walk in the right direction and turn back on critical parts of our government. I hope that’s what we’re moving toward, Mr. Speaker.

So my friend knows, I’m quite prepared to close whenever she wishes to close.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am absolutely going to vote to retroactively fund the Federal employees because that’s the best I can do, on that one issue. It is a matter of basic fairness, but it is not good enough.

The fact is that the Federal employees will not get paid their retroactive money until after all this charade is over. We have no idea when that’s going to be.

Let me reiterate again what all my colleagues have said: we can do it right now, put them back to work and let them get their paycheck.

I’m embarrassed every time I pass the Capitol Police at what’s happening to them. It bothers me terribly to hear my friends at the State Department say that they’re working on fumes.

We cannot run the Government of the United States, which is the beacon of democracy, has been the pattern for countries all over the world, by saying we’re going to fund this piece over there and that piece over there, and we don’t care what happens to the rest of it. That’s not what we are here for.

Certainly, we will fund that one piece; but I can tell you right now, the Democrats are not going to do any of the rest of it because the Senate is not going to take it up and the President is not going to sign it.

We are simply wasting time, and we’re taking up valuable time, and we are worrying the country half to death.

For heaven’s sake, when we do this previous question, let us do the right thing. Vote “no” and get all these folks back to work.

Does it literally make sense to anybody who either manages a household or their own business that we would say to everybody, go home and rest around here or there; we’ll pay you later when we decide you can come back, for not being here. That makes absolutely no sense.

Let them go back to work. We’re going to pay them. Pay them now for the work they’re doing. Pay concurrently with work.

Doesn’t that make more sense?

Does it really make any sense at all that we’re saying to them, we have no idea what the end game is here. You may be sitting around for a very long time, while the country pays \$300 million a day of the cost of the shutdown.

For heaven’s sake, I would say once again that we have to do this previous question today. We have to stop this nonsense. It is humiliating us. We cannot go on with this another week.

We’re only here today to try to make it look like we’re doing something because the government’s shut down, and we know it. Those bills that we’re voting on today had no committee action, nothing. The Senate has made perfectly clear they’re not going to take them up. They will not become law, as every school child knows.

Now, those who vote “no” on ordering the previous question will be giving this Chamber what the leadership of the Majority has not, and that will be the real chance to vote this down so that we can put the CR on the calendar and stop the shutdown now, today.

It doesn’t have to go back to the Senate. The President’s waiting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, I beg my colleagues, I do implore my colleagues, for goodness sakes, come to the floor, defeat the previous question. Vote “no.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my good friend from New York. She’s always a terrific, frankly, counterpoint and debater, and we agree on some things. We both agree that the government shutdown’s not a good thing.

Frankly, there’s a strong bipartisan agreement. It’s not something that either side wished to achieve, and it’s something we ought to be working together, step by step, to try and undo; and, frankly, we’ve made a little bit of progress.

Again, the idea that it never works to work piecemeal, it certainly did with respect to the United States military, civilian defense force, and contractors. That’s exactly what we did.

We passed something out of here; and the Senate, which said it wasn’t going to agree to anything, magically did.

Now we’re going to, hopefully, eventually pass H.R. 3223 out of here to guarantee back pay. I think most people on both sides of the aisle will support that. The President’s indicated he’ll sign it, which suggests to me that the Senate will probably take it up and move on it. So, voila.

Once again, just working through the process, we’ve found something that we can agree on. The differences here should not be so great that they can’t be bridged.

Just to remind everyone of the history, we have placed multiple offers concerning the Affordable Care Act before the Senate. The last offer seems to me something that we ought to be able to agree on, or certainly be willing to sit down and discuss. It only has two points, and it’s basically a question of fairness.

Why should Members of Congress and high appointees in the executive branch and our staffs go into the exchange and be able to bring subsidies with us, when no other American can do that?

It’s just not fair.

Now, we could amend the law and let everybody come into the exchanges with subsidies. That would be fair. Or we could say, you know, really, Members of Congress and their staff are at a fundamental level employees of the Federal Government and they ought to be in that, and that would be fair. But let's treat everybody the same.

More fundamentally, currently, the President has unilaterally decided to exempt 1,100-plus organizations. He's unilaterally, in a questionable measure, constitutionally, decided to suspend parts of the law for a year and exempt Big Business.

We think, gosh, if you're going to do that, shouldn't every single American have the right to decide whether or not they want to participate in this for just 1 year until everybody is actually operating under the same system?

That too is a question of fairness. Give every individual American the same relief from a mandate that you're giving Big Business and Big Labor. It just seems to me commonsensical.

It doesn't mean you have to stop the exchanges.

□ 1345

You don't have to undo the program. Just treat everybody the same. Be fair. That's the Republican proposal in front of the Senate right now, and, frankly, I think they probably don't want to discuss it because it's a hard one to say "no" to because it's fundamentally fair. And that's all we've asked, is that the Senate, which has rejected it, at least come to conference and talk about it.

The real issue here beyond the questions of policy is whether the Senate is going to be allowed to dictate unilaterally what the House does. Is it just going to say, no, you've to do it our way? We're not going to negotiate. We're not going to go to conference. We're not going to deal with you. You have to do it our way. That's not the way the system was set up.

My friend, Chairman ROGERS, pointed that out quite succinctly. We've got a way to handle this. It's called go to conference, argue, and work out the differences. And I suspect we're going to see the same thing a little bit down the road from the President, who's told us and told the Speaker this week, I'm not going to negotiate with you on raising the debt ceiling in the United States. You just have to do it unilaterally. You have to put the country further into debt without any discussion of what we can do to change the trajectory of that debt.

Now, that's a remarkable change from where he was in August of 2011. A remarkable change. He was in a very different place and position and was willing to sit down and talk. I don't know why he would change that now.

So I think we should do something in this bill to build on this piecemeal approach. We should pass these different measures. We agree these parts of government ought to be open; and we

should continue to work through, conference with our friends in the Senate and ultimately in negotiation with the President of the United States on the debt ceiling.

And so I urge the adoption of this rule.

In closing, I'd like to, again, say that one of the basic functions of Congress is to fund government. This rule would allow 10 or more pieces of that government to open again to provide for crucial services that they provide. I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I again rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying resolution.

I oppose this rule because it is not a serious effort to end the government shutdown engineered by House Republicans by cherry-picking some programs to fund while leaving unfunded other programs critical to our nation and its future.

Both President Obama and Senate Majority Leader REID have made it crystal clear that they will not accept this game-playing because the piecemeal strategy now being pursued by House Republicans is not an honest or serious option to reopen the government and will not end the impacts of this shutdown that extend across our country.

Mr. Speaker, USA Today said it best and I quote:

House Republicans who forced the government closure offered to reopen some of the most popular programs, such as the Department of Veterans Affairs, on a piecemeal basis. It's like seizing a school bus full of kids then offering to release the cutest ones. The mounting toll will increasingly expose the shutdown's foolishness. The sooner the Republicans free all their hostages, the better.

Initially, our friends across the aisle were content to take the whole nation hostage by refusing to fund the government unless the Affordable Care Act was defunded. That effort failed. Undaunted, House Republicans tried again. The effort failed again.

This past Monday, the House Republicans refused for the third time to take up and vote on the clean CR passed by the Senate last week, and which the President has stated publicly on several occasions he would sign.

Instead House Republicans voted to shut down the government.

Now faced with strong public backlash—more than 70% of Americans disapproving of the government shutdown engineered by the House Republicans, the majority is trying to extricate themselves from this debacle by bringing to the floor and passing "mini-CRs" providing minimal funding for the following programs that enjoy strong and broad public support:

- (1) Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act (H.J. Res. 75);
- (2) Nuclear Weapon Security & Non-Proliferation Act, (H.J. Res. 76);
- (3) Food and Drug Safety Act (H.J. Res. 77);
- (4) Preserving Our Intelligence Capabilities Act (H.J. Res. 78);
- (5). Border Safety & Security Act (H.J. Res. 79);
- (6) American Indian and Alaska Native, Health, Education, and Safety Act (H.J. Res. 80);

(7) National Weather Monitoring Act (H.J. Res. 82);

(8) Impact Aid for Local Schools Act (H.J. Res. 83);

(9) Head Start for Low-Income Children Act (H.J. Res. 84);

(10) National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act (H.J. Res. 85); and

H.R. 3223—Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act (H.R. 3223).

Mr. Speaker, these plays are a cynical waste of time giving false hope to innocent Americans who depend on the services provided by these programs. But House Republicans know they have no chance whatsoever of becoming law. The Senate will not pass them and the President would veto these piece-meal measures if they made it to his desk.

All we are doing is wasting time when we should be helping people.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can keep our promises to our veterans, as well as the doctors, nurses, and hospital workers who take care of our wounded and healthy warriors.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund our engineers and technicians who maintain all of our critical military equipment to keep our troops safe and take care of national security infrastructure.

We need to pass the clean CR approved by the Senate so we can fund our IT security folks who protect us from cyber-attacks, and our astronauts who risk their lives to push the technical boundaries of knowledge for all mankind.

These exceptional Americans, and the people who depend on them and benefit from their work, do not deserve to have been locked out of their workplaces since Tuesday.

These exceptional Americans deserve a Congress that does its job and keeps America open for business.

For these reasons and more, I oppose this rule and the underlying amendments it makes in order and urge my colleagues to join me in urging the passage of H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate so that the federal government will reopen for business to serve the American people and end the disruption in the lives of 800,000 dedicated workers who take pride in the greatest jobs in the world: serving the American people.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 371 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, shall be taken from the Speaker's table and the pending question shall be, without intervention of any point of order, whether the House shall recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of receding from the House amendment and concurring in the Senate amendment without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

Sec. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in section 6 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1430

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 371; adopting the resolution, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 371) providing for consideration of the bill (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII

with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 184, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Gowdy	Petri
Amash	Granger	Pitts
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Poe (TX)
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Pompeo
Bachus	Griffith (AR)	Posey
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Price (GA)
Barr	Grimm	Radel
Barton	Guthrie	Reed
Benishek	Hall	Reichert
Bentivolio	Hanna	Renacci
Bilirakis	Harper	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Rice (SC)
Black	Hartzler	Rigell
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Roby
Boustany	Heck (NV)	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Rokita
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rooney
Bucshon	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Hurt	Roskam
Calvert	Issa	Ross
Camp	Jenkins	Rothfus
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Royce
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Runyan
Capito	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Joyce	Salmon
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Chabot	King (NY)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kingston	Schock
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Coffman	Kline	Scott, Austin
Cole	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Shimkus
Conaway	Lance	Shuster
Cook	Lankford	Simpson
Cotton	Latham	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Latta	Smith (NE)
Crawford	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Long	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Lucas	Southerland
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Stivers
Denham	Marino	Stockman
Dent	Massie	Stutzman
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
DesJarlais	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Thornberry
Duffy	McHenry	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McKeon	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McKinley	Upton
Ellmers	McMorris	Valadao
Farenthold	Rodgers	Wagner
Fincher	Meadows	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Walden
Fleischmann	Messer	Walorski
Fleming	Mica	Weber (TX)
Flores	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Miller (MI)	West
Fortenberry	Mullin	Westmoreland
Fox	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Noem	Wittman
Garrett	Nugent	Wolf
Gerlach	Nunes	Womack
Gibbs	Nunnelee	Woodall
Gibson	Olson	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Palazzo	Yoho
Gohmert	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Pearce	Young (IN)
Gosar	Perry	

NAYS—184

Andrews	Barrow (GA)	Becerra
Barber	Beatty	Bera (CA)

Bishop (GA) Gutiérrez
 Bishop (NY) Hahn
 Blumenauer Hanabusa
 Bonamici Hastings (FL)
 Brady (PA) Himes
 Braley (IA) Hinojosa
 Brown (FL) Holt
 Brownley (CA) Honda
 Bustos Horsford
 Butterfield Hoyer
 Capps Huffman
 Capuano Israel
 Carney Jackson Lee
 Carson (IN) Jeffries
 Cartwright Johnson (GA)
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Castro (TX) Kaptur
 Chu Keating
 Cicilline Kelly (IL)
 Clarke Kennedy
 Clay Kildee
 Cleaver Kilmer
 Clyburn Kind
 Cohen Kirkpatrick
 Connolly Kuster
 Conyers Langevin
 Cooper Larsen (WA)
 Costa Larson (CT)
 Courtney Lee (CA)
 Crowley Levin
 Cuellar Lewis
 Davis (CA) Lipinski
 Davis, Danny Loebsock
 DeFazio Lofgren
 DeGette Lowenthal
 Delaney Lowey
 DeLauro Lujan Grisham
 DelBene (NM)
 Deutch Luján, Ben Ray
 Dingell (NM)
 Doggett Lynch
 Doyle Maffei
 Duckworth Maloney, Sean
 Edwards Matheson
 Ellison Matsui
 Engel McCollum
 Enyart McDermott
 Eshoo McGovern
 Esty McIntyre
 Farr McNeerney
 Fattah Meeks
 Foster Meng
 Frankel (FL) Michaud
 Fudge Miller, George
 Gabbard Moore
 Gallego Moran
 Garamendi Murphy (FL)
 Garcia Nadler
 Green, Al Napolitano
 Green, Gene Neal
 Grijalva Negrete McLeod

NOT VOTING—24

Bass Lummis
 Cárdenas Maloney,
 Cummings Carolyn
 Grayson McCarthy (NY)
 Heck (WA) Miller, Gary
 Herrera Beutler Perlmutter
 Higgins Pittenger
 Jones Rush
 King (IA) Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1453

Messrs. LUETKEYMEYER and KINZINGER of Illinois changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 183, not voting 26, as follows:

Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar

Aderholt
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishak
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucsnon
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar

[Roll No. 520]

YEAS—222

Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (PA)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Lankford
 Latham
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Petri

Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loebsock
 Lofgren

Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney, Sean
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Richmond

Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—26

Bass
 Cárdenas
 Cummings
 Grayson
 Gutiérrez
 Heck (WA)
 Herrera Beutler
 Higgins
 Jones
 King (IA)
 Lummis
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 McCarthy (NY)
 Miller, Gary
 Nolan
 Perlmutter
 Peterson
 Pittenger
 Rush
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sires
 Tipton
 Vargas
 Visclosky
 Yarmuth
 Young (FL)

□ 1501

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 371

OFFERED BY MR. COLE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify House Resolution 371 with the correction placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 14, strike “referred” and insert “referred”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

NAYS—183

Andrews
 Barber
 Barrow (GA)
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 85) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 85

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the Federal Emergency Management Agency for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (division D of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading "Protection, Preparedness, Response, and Recovery—Federal Emergency Management Agency".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Federal Emergency Management Agency Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 85, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present to the House a bill to fully sustain funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, commonly known as FEMA.

Right now, at this very moment, dedicated men and women at FEMA are preparing for the possible landfall of Tropical Storm Karen along our gulf coast, and they're not being paid. Right now, at this very moment, FEMA has begun to recall furloughed employees in Atlanta, Georgia, and Denton, Texas, as the agency prepares for a potential significant natural disaster.

According to the National Weather Service, a hurricane watch is currently in effect from Grand Isle, Louisiana, eastward to Destin, Florida. A tropical storm watch is currently in effect from west of Grand Isle to east of Morgan City, Louisiana, and New Orleans and east of Destin to Indian Pass, Florida.

Mr. Speaker, this is a major storm, and we have to take it seriously. So this bill before us provides for continuing appropriations to ensure FEMA can fully render assistance to the impacted States and fully support our citizens and our brave first responders.

Mr. Speaker, all of us were aware that the government is shut down despite numerous attempts to move forward. We have repeatedly offered visions of a continuing resolution to sustain this government's operations, but to no avail. Furthermore, we have offered to negotiate, to convene a conference, and to work out the differences in a professional and orderly manner, but such offers have been refused out of hand. So, Mr. Speaker, this bill is yet another offer to the other side of the aisle to at least fund vital components of this government.

We have a duty to ensure that our Nation is adequately prepared for disasters and that our States are fully supported when they require Federal assistance. This bill does so without increasing the rate of spending and in a manner entirely consistent with the text of the noncontroversial H.J. Res. 59.

In short, this bill before us today is all about getting our priorities right. It's my hope that passage of this bill will not only support our Nation's emergency preparedness but also lead to a reopening of the entire Federal Government.

In closing, I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to lower their partisan blinders, come to the table, and work out our current impasses so that we can get on with the business of fixing our Nation's budgetary mess.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, how much longer are we going to continue this charade? At what expense are we going to continue this charade?

The Federal employees who serve our country are being disserved, as well as the American people who depend on their services. How much longer are we going to continue this same tired old dishonest debate?

Today it's about FEMA. We appreciate the Republicans' concern for FEMA. Like them, we are also anxiously watching the approach of Hurricane Karen. It's too bad that our Republican friends didn't think a little bit more about such things on Monday midnight when they shut the government down.

The issue, of course, is not whether we want to provide funding for FEMA or for any other particular activity or particular group of Federal employees. I'll take a back seat to no one when it comes to supporting the men and women who serve on the front lines of our national disaster preparedness and response efforts. And we know they will be there, whatever Hurricane Karen amounts to.

The issue here is whether we are going to pick winners and losers by providing temporary funding for governmental services, operations, and personnel when everyone in this body knows that we could reopen the entire

Federal Government in one fell swoop this afternoon by calling up the Senate-passed continuing resolution. That's what Democrats and a growing number of Republicans are advocating, and it's the only path that will get us out of this mess.

Instead, the House majority continues to bring to the floor piecemeal measures like this one, measures that may be red meat for TED CRUZ, but they have no chance of passing the Senate or being signed by the President because they don't solve the basic problem.

□ 1515

Therefore, they are a cynical and cruel deception. We all know that. So let's quit playing games, and let's actually do our job for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, if we're going to resume funding for parts of the Department of Homeland Security, I'd like to ask, where's the bill that's going to fund the Secret Service, whose importance was on full display yesterday?

Where's the bill to ensure our aviation system remains safe and secure through TSA?

Where's the bill to keep us safe from cyber attacks?

Of course we all want to provide funding for FEMA, but what about all the other employees of the Department of Homeland Security who work every day to ensure the security of our Nation?

What about the Border Patrol agents, Customs and Border Protection officers, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement agents?

They're all protecting our Nation, and they're protecting it without pay at this moment.

Well, maybe the House majority will eventually get to them or, then again, maybe they won't. It's becoming more and more difficult to tell whom the Republican majority cares about at any given moment.

Now, there have been charges of a lack of willingness to negotiate and compromise on the part of the President and congressional Democrats.

Let's be clear: the only ones who have compromised on anything related to funding the government are Democrats. We have compromised to the tune of \$60 billion, that is, agreeing to a short-term continuing resolution well below the President's budget request, well below the Senate-passed budget resolution.

And by the way, that's the same budget resolution that Republicans have refused to work on with the Senate and that would have headed off this shutdown in the first place. It really must take some nerve for our colleagues now, all of a sudden, to be singing the praises of conference committees!

But as to the Senate's clean bipartisan funding bill, we don't need a conference committee. We don't need to talk. We need a vote. The clean con-

tinuing resolution would pass this House easily, right this minute, if the Republican leadership would simply put it up for a bipartisan vote.

So let's dispense with this political theater. Let's get back to our basic job description which, surely, by any measure, involves keeping the government open. It also involves paying the country's bills, and it must involve a comprehensive budget plan that lifts sequestration, revives our economy, and reduces our deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me this time.

And I say to my colleague from North Carolina, my friend, whom I've served together with on the Appropriations Committee and subcommittees for a number of years, I say to him, where is the bill for the Secret Service?

Stay tuned.

Where's the bill for ICE?

Stay tuned.

Where's the bill for Border Patrol?

Stay tuned and be ready to talk about those when they come up shortly.

Now, I rise in support of this bill, which will help ensure that our government can help prepare for emergency situations. As we well know, you can never be too prepared.

Over the past year, we've seen the damage natural disasters can wreak. From Hurricane Sandy in the Northeast, to the tornados in the Midwest, to the raging wildfires out West, no area is immune to Mother Nature's wrath.

And now, with a tropical storm brewing in the Gulf of Mexico, we are reminded, once again, that disaster can strike when you least expect it to, or when you can least stand it, though we hope that's not the case with Karen.

This bill will provide immediate funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency at the current annual funding rate of \$10.2 billion. As with the previous five short-term funding bills this House has passed in the last 2 days, this will last until December 15, but could end sooner if we can find a way to fund the entire Federal Government before that time.

And as with the previous five short-term funding bills, this language, for all intents and purposes, mirrors that of the clean CR that I offered several weeks ago.

Passing this bill today is important to fulfill our duty to the people of this country that their government should help communities prepare for disasters and be there in their times of greatest need.

However, our end goal isn't to fund each government program bit by bit; it's to reopen the whole Federal Government as soon as possible. I believe

this bill inches us closer to that goal, but there's obviously much more to be done.

And let me point this out, Mr. Speaker: if this bill is approved today, this will be the sixth clean, short-term funding bill we send to the other side of the Capitol. These bills provide more than \$300 billion in annual funding so far, and at the sequester level. That's one-third of the discretionary budget, and it's one-third of the original continuing resolution that we filed in September; one third of the way toward opening the entire Federal Government with clean funding bills.

This is what the Senate says they want. So why aren't they voting on these bills?

In addition to these clean bills, we've also sent over to the Senate seven other appropriations bills to fund portions of the Federal Government. The answer: a loud snore.

This House, since the Republicans took over in 2011, has been serious about trying to return to regular order; but it takes two to tango, Mr. Speaker, and the Senate has passed zero regular appropriations bills this whole year. Zero.

I say we must come together. On Monday night, the House passed another amendment, sent it to the Senate, that would have funded the entire government. And we asked for a conference with the Senate. We even appointed our conferees, the House, sent that to the Senate.

What have we heard from the Senate since that time?

Another loud snore. They will not agree to talk.

It's the time-honored tradition of this Congress, in the United States of America, that when one body disagrees with the other body, which is quite frequent, what happens, we appoint conferees to work out the differences.

The House appointed its conferees. The Senate has refused to appoint conferees. Otherwise, we could sit down and talk and solve this problem and put people back to work in the government and make sense of the mess that we're in. It just takes the Senate agreeing to go to a conference.

What's difficult about that?

That's as simple as pie. It's what we've done since we've been a Nation.

I would urge the other body to appoint conferees. Let's sit down and work out the differences. We've got a table waiting downstairs, or we can meet over there, whatever. We can meet in their conference room or ours. We can sit down, as gentlemen and gentleladies, and work out the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill as we normally do.

We've got to come together, Mr. Speaker, Senate, House, Republican, Democrat, Mugwump. We've got to have a meaningful discussion on how we can fund the entire Federal Government, first, to reopen its doors, then to fund it as it should be funded, with regular order, full-year appropriations bills.

The bill before us continues trying to make sense of the situation we're in, working toward ending the shutdown, and to ensure that from today forward FEMA has the resources it needs to prepare for whatever should come our way.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend from Kentucky, the chairman of the full committee is, in a time-honored House tradition, criticizing the other body. I've done some of that myself.

But let's be clear about a couple of things. Our Republican friends, as I recall, for years were badgering the Senate to pass a budget resolution. This year they did it. They did it and were ready to go to conference months ago; they were ready to go to conference with a budget resolution that was comprehensive in dealing with the deficit. And had that been agreed upon between the two Houses, it could have prevented this whole mess.

From all indications, it is the House Republicans, the leadership of this body, that has refused to go to conference. I don't really think that's in dispute.

Secondly, my friend from Kentucky, and many speakers in the last few days, have talked about all those appropriations bills and how they didn't make it to the floor of the Senate. What they didn't tell you was why they didn't make it to the floor of the Senate.

Again, I don't think this is open to dispute. The Transportation-HUD appropriations bill was ready for floor action on the Senate side. It was a threatened Republican filibuster that kept it off the floor and that has kept all subsequent bills off the floor.

I assure you, the Senate leadership and Senator MIKULSKI, the appropriations chairman in the Senate, were more than ready to take those appropriations bills to the floor. In many cases, they had been written with good bipartisan cooperation.

But it is the Republican leadership who dictated that the Senate would not pass those appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my friend, the ranking member of our full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown.

Of course we support disaster assistance. Time and time again, Democrats have voted to provide expeditious disaster assistance; but FEMA also needs State and local first responders, the National Weather Service, transportation, housing assistance, and other items that are not funded in this bill.

This bill is perhaps the most cynical political ploy Republicans have put forward since the shutdown began. Just a week ago, this body strongly supported Federal assistance for devastating floods in Colorado. I'd like to

remind my friends that its sponsor, ironically, voted against much-needed recovery funds following Superstorm Sandy.

Too many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not believe in the Federal Government until they need it; and, boy, do they need the Federal Government now. Since it shut down, they are paying a political price and using irresponsible bills like this one to shift the blame.

Not only should the Federal Government be available to respond to every Federal disaster; it should be open to keep Americans on the job, to support law enforcement, to ensure Head Start centers are open so parents can work, and to continue lifesaving medical research, to name a few of its vital functions.

You claim to want to negotiate. We have already said we will vote for your spending bill at your funding levels, and I know my friends on the other side of the aisle understand that.

So let's stop playing games. Allow a vote on your bill to end the shutdown that the Senate passed and the President will sign.

We can open this government in the next 30 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), the hardworking chair of the authorizing Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness and Response and Communications.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications, I rise in support of the National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act, which does provide the vital funding for Federal Emergency Management Agency, funding that can make a difference right now.

And it is right now that we need to be caring about the citizens of Louisiana, Alabama and Mississippi, as Tropical Storm Karen is in the Gulf of Mexico headed toward the gulf coast. Landfall is expected this weekend. We don't know what to expect, much like we didn't know what to expect when Hurricane Sandy hit.

FEMA has begun its response of preparations and has recalled those furloughed staff because they know it's their duty to serve and protect. So this bill would ensure that all FEMA personnel and capabilities are available to respond to this storm and support the States in its path.

□ 1530

Hurricane season doesn't end this weekend. It doesn't end officially until November 30. We have to make sure that these agencies are ready to respond, whether it's a natural disaster, a terrorist attack, or other emergency needing Federal support.

I have tell you, this is not a game. This is not a charade. And until now, I have been so pleased to serve on Home-

land Security, where it enjoys so much bipartisan support. We have much bipartisan support when it comes to FEMA and homeland security. And I would like to say that, until now, they do not play games when it comes to supporting first responders, when it comes to supporting flood victims, when it comes to supporting storm and hurricane victims.

But I must say the time to act with Congress is now. Do the right thing. We are encouraging our colleagues across the other side of the aisle to put the politics aside and join us in supporting this resolution.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), ranking member of the Homeland Security authorizing committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Thank you very much, Ranking Member PRICE, for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 85. This is the latest in a string of measures that the Republican majority has brought to the floor in an attempt to cherry-pick what gets funded in the Federal Government, or a piecemeal approach to running government.

Later this weekend, Tropical Storm Karen is expected to hit the gulf coast. Last night, there were strong reports of tornados in Nebraska, and a strong storm is expected in our area. I guess that explains this cynical exercise where FEMA is funded in a mini-CR.

When the majority learned that tourists could not visit our national monuments, they whipped up a mini-CR for the national parks. A storm is coming so their answer is a mini-CR for FEMA. The way the majority does business, there will need to be another West, Texas, explosion before they try to fund CFATS.

We can't fund the government crisis to crisis. FEMA should have its full staff available this week to begin preparations for Tropical Storm Karen. Instead, FEMA is beginning to recall furloughed employees today—a rush to prepare for the storm.

And as we know, restoring FEMA's funding alone is not enough to ensure a successful disaster response. We need the full resources of the Federal Government—from the Department of Transportation to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Small Business Administration. We also need the full resources of the Department of Homeland Security.

It's time to stop the games. The events on Capitol Hill yesterday should have served as a wake-up call. The Speaker must allow a vote on a clean CR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Federal employees who return to work to help to respond to Tropical

Storm Karen, the forecasted tornados, or any other disaster that strikes should be able to do that work with the peace of mind that their paychecks are coming and that their bills will be paid. All Federal employees deserve that.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), whose State seems to be possibly in the path of this coming storm.

Mr. CASSIDY. First, let's put in perspective exactly what is before the House for overall government funding.

House Republicans have put forward a bill that would fund the government. We had two amendments, which are opposed. One would end the special deal that only Senators and Members of the House of Representatives get as regards ObamaCare exchanges. The other would treat employees of the employers whose mandate has been postponed the same. So if an employer's mandate to purchase insurance for employees has been postponed, the obligation of the employee to purchase is also.

It's on these two amendments that these folks object, Mr. Speaker. One, they want to preserve the special deal for Members of Congress; and, two, they don't want workers to have the same deal as does the employer.

Now that said, this brings us to this. If we can't fund the government because we have to preserve a special deal for Members of the Senate and of Congress, then at least we can mitigate its harmful effects.

My gosh, a hurricane bearing down on your coastline is the ultimate in a harmful effect. I don't think we should hold hostage protection for those in harm's way so that Congress can preserve a special deal that only accrues to Members of Congress, speaking of cynicism. We cannot sacrifice the security of those on the gulf coast.

I call upon the Senate to call on a vote both on these special amendments, but if not that, at least on funding of FEMA. In so doing, we can do something really good for those who do rely upon the Federal Government not all the time but in times of need.

And also, if we can vote on those two special amendments, we can do something good for the taxpayers who really, despite all the effort to obfuscate, are beginning to understand that our budget agreement is being held up by the need to preserve a special deal for Senators and Representatives.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a fellow Appropriations member.

Mr. FARR. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I'm an appropriator, like a lot of the speakers here today; and every time we have to deal with the CR, we're embarrassed. That's not our work. Our work is in appropriations bills, which we spend all year putting together. And we've been doing that.

We were in the same situation last year, everything being the same. The Obama health care bill was in the law, Members of Congress had their insurance, and whatever issue was being brought up—we can't approve the CR because—those were the same issues last year. And guess what? We moved the CR without rancor and without partisan politics. So what's the difference here?

I feel very sorry for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to now have to defend appropriations by choice.

Ronald Reagan used to be fond of saying, Here we go again. And today, it's open choice. It's pick your government. We've got 10 items on the menu.

Mr. Speaker, I want the whole menu, not just the Tea Party special.

What an irony that we are bringing up the first of these menus, FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Shut down the whole government, but we want to keep those emergency employees. I was a firefighter. I was a first responder. I was part of a team like the team that was lost in Arizona—the Hot Shot crew—when I was in college. They're not a part of FEMA. They're not a first responder. So firefighters are out.

All of the cleanup that has to be done from the Colorado fire and the Rim fire in California, those people aren't part of the first responders. They're not in this.

This bill is a process of just selection, of chaos, and of a menu—pick off what you can support, take the popular things and pass those. But guess what? These first responders have children. They have no access to the school lunch program. These responders have spouses. There's all kinds of programs for families that they have no response for.

This first responder bill doesn't go to school cops, Centers for Disease Control, food safety officers, or any of the others.

Please defeat it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 6½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), another appropriations colleague, the ranking member of the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend from North Carolina.

Let me first address the issue that we just heard about on the floor and I seem to hear about every time I turn on the news when a Member of the other party is speaking about it. It's this suggestion that Members of Congress want to keep some special treatment for themselves in terms of health insurance.

The fact is that the vast majority of large employers pay for most of their employees' health insurance costs. Members of Congress are part of what is called the Federal Employees Health Benefits plan. On average, about 72 percent of our insurance is paid for by our employer.

I know in my case, since I have a family and had a daughter that had a massive malignant brain tumor, I'm not going to go without insurance. But I pay \$6,000 a year, which I suspect a lot of my colleagues do. And then I pay another few thousand in terms of copayments and deductibles. And yet mine is one of the best plans that you can get with Blue Cross Blue Shield. So that's not out of the mainstream in terms of health insurance.

The fact is that the President only delayed a reporting requirement with regard to large employers.

Now, let me get back to this case in point with regard to FEMA. When we have a natural disaster, such as this hurricane that's bearing down on the coast of Louisiana, the Federal Government comes in as a team. We know that. I know Mr. CARTER knows that. I know my good friend from Kentucky knows that the Federal agencies all get together as a team.

And they know how important, for example, the Army Corps of Engineers is. The Army Corps of Engineers works hand-in-glove with FEMA. The Interior Department provides firefighter and emergency response before and after a disaster. We just had these large fires in California and Idaho. The fire is out so now they're furloughed. Is that really what we want to do?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MORAN. I greatly thank my close friend from North Carolina.

The U.S. Geological Survey has to activate stream gauges and storm surge measurements. It's technical, but it's important. But 99 percent of the USGS is furloughed.

The Small Business Administration Office of Disaster Assistance comes in in an emergency and tries to help small businesses that have been wiped out, which invariably happens and will happen with this storm, unfortunately. But they're all furloughed. They're not going to be able to be there.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service, they play a critical role. Ninety-nine percent of those employees are furloughed. The Farm Services Agency, 99 percent of those employees are furloughed.

That's the problem. They need to work as a team, and here we are with these bits and pieces of the government, and we think we're going to patch this up. We're not. The fact is that the whole of government needs to be put back to work. That's our argument.

Let's do this the right way, not in this kind of piecemeal fashion. That's

why we're forced to vote against these things. The fact is we voted to keep them open. The side that's proposing this piecemeal approach voted to shut down the government.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we ever took a vote to shut down the government. If we did, I certainly missed it. I don't believe anybody ever took a vote recently to sustain the government.

But it's an interesting comment, and I thank my friend for making it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Border and Maritime Subcommittee of Homeland Security.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his courtesies.

I am sad that I have to rise to debate this conflicted position from my good friends on the other side of the aisle. Yes, they care about homeland security. It's a committee I've served on since 9/11. We have a great camaraderie. We work in a bipartisan manner, but today I'm saddened by the approach that's been taken, particularly since they all know that this is a fool's errand.

USA Today said that this piecemeal process is like seizing a school bus full of kids and then offering to release the cutest ones.

We don't have time to fool around with the cutest ones.

FEMA works closely with States, cities, tribes, and territories, and communities large and small. Those of us who are now looking to the barreling down of Karen on the gulf region understand about hurricanes and tornados and other disasters.

So I offer to my colleagues Allison, which killed 23 in 2001, with some \$5 billion in damages. We need FEMA.

□ 1545

Or Hurricane Ike, that cost some \$29 billion in damage in Galveston. We need FEMA. Or the tornados in Oklahoma on May 31 that killed 23. We need FEMA. Or maybe talking about the issues of dealing with Hurricane Katrina—the largest and most devastating hurricane that we have seen. We need FEMA. But yet my friends are willing to piecemeal. And by doing so, Homeland Security is dashed, Border Patrol Agents are not funded, and the Secret Service protection activities are not funded.

I am aghast at the fact that Federal air marshals—as we thank our Capitol Police, who yesterday showed themselves willing to sacrifice themselves, and other law enforcement—Federal air marshals' travel and training is shut down. And then ICE is shut down.

Homeland Security is comprehensive. It deals with fighting al Qaeda and the terrorists who would do us harm, and it deals with being a helping hand, as FEMA is, as I've worked alongside of

FEMA in the gulf when people were devastated.

Mr. Speaker, we can't do this. Put a clean bill on the floor, the CR, vote for it, and open the government now. And let Homeland Security and FEMA do their job as Hurricane Karen barrels toward us.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and the Ranking Member of its Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I rise to speak on H.J. Res. 85, the "National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act," which makes continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for FY 2014.

I note the Administration strongly opposes House passage of piecemeal fiscal year 2014 appropriations legislation that restores only very limited activities.

I agree that consideration of appropriations bills in this fashion is not a serious or responsible way to run the United States Government. Instead of opening up a few Government functions, the House of Representatives should pass the clean CR passed by the Senate to end this Republican shutdown and reopen the Government and end the damage that the shutdown is causing to our economy and the lives of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, FEMA works closely with states, cities, tribes, territories, and communities large and small to help prepare for and respond to disasters and emergencies of all kinds. It provides funding through homeland security grants, support training and exercises, assess state and local response capabilities and recommend needed improvements. FEMA supports recovery and rebuilding efforts after a disaster. Cuts to FEMA would have significant, negative impacts on our nation's disaster preparedness, response and recovery efforts.

Weeks after Congress passed the recent FY 2013 Disaster Assistance Supplemental Act (P.L. 113-2) to aid the victims of Hurricane Sandy, sequestration reduced the Disaster Relief Fund (DRF) by over \$1 billion, which adversely affected recovery efforts in the communities struck by Hurricane Sandy, the tornadoes in Tuscaloosa and Joplin, and other major disasters across the Nation. Sequestration cuts could also require FEMA to implement Immediate Needs Funding Restrictions late in the fiscal year during what is historically the season for tornados, wildfires, and hurricanes, which would limit funding for new projects in older disasters.

Finally, state and local homeland security grants funding has been reduced to its lowest level in the past seven years, leading to potential layoffs of state and local emergency personnel across our country.

Hurricane Sandy, recent threats surrounding aviation and the continued threat of homegrown terrorism demonstrate the continuing importance of vigilance and preparation to protect our nation and its people. Threats from terrorism and response and recovery efforts associated with natural disasters will not diminish because of the House Republicans' desire to reduce funding for DHS and FEMA and continue their shutdown of the government.

Even in this current fiscal climate, we do not have the luxury of making significant reductions to our capabilities without placing our Nation at risk. If we are to continue to prepare for, respond to, and recover from evolving threats and disasters, we will need sufficient

resources to sustain and adapt our capabilities accordingly. While we will continue to preserve our frontline priorities as best we can, no amount of planning can mitigate the negative effects of sequestration.

The bill before us today, is \$40 billion less than what we have been working with as a result of the draconian sequestration. H.J. Res. 85 will significantly and negatively affect frontline operations and our Nation's previous investments in homeland security. This bill, while providing minimal funding for FEMA, is wholly inadequate because it does not provide funding for:

Army Corps of Engineers which supports emergency preparedness and response for critical infrastructure such as dams, flood control levees and navigation channels.

Interior Department which performs firefighting and emergency response on Federal lands during and after a disaster. Currently, all damage repairs have stopped except for emergency repairs. While firefighting personnel are on call to deal with any fires, post-fire work has stopped, including damage assessments of the recent large fires in California and Idaho. Hazardous fuel projects to prevent future fires have been put on hold during the shutdown.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) would normally activate additional stream gages and storm surge measurements but instead will have to rely on existing monitoring stations for any hurricanes that happen during the shutdown. 99 percent of USGS employees are furloughed.

Small Business Administration, Office of Disaster Assistance provides affordable, timely and accessible financial assistance to homeowners, renters and businesses following a disaster. Employees in the Office of Disaster Assistance continue to work without being paid.

USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) provides assistance to communities to address watershed impairments that pose imminent threats to lives and property. 99 percent of NRCS employees are furloughed.

USDA, Farm Services Agency (FSA) provides funding and technical assistance to farmers and ranchers to restore farmland and forestland damaged by natural disasters. 99 percent of FSA employees are furloughed and therefore can't begin to survey the damage and preparing estimates of the need.

Mr. Speaker, so far this past year our nation has experienced several major floods, record snowfalls, catastrophic disasters and terrorist attacks. In fact, many communities throughout our great nation and country are continuing to recover from previous disasters and terrorist attacks. We must provide aid for our constituents and not allow politics to get in the way of protecting our homeland.

A fully functioning FEMA is needed to continue the work of helping communities recover from recent disasters and terrorist attacks. It is Congress's responsibility to ensure that FEMA has the needed resources to respond to future disasters and terrorist attacks. I assure you that I am aware of the challenges our communities face once we are confronted with a catastrophic event or a domestic terrorist attack.

My constituents in Houston understand that our capacity to deal with hurricanes directly reflects our ability to respond to a terrorist attack in Texas or New York, an earthquake in California, or a nationwide pandemic flu outbreak.

I would like to say a few words about the devastating hurricane that struck Texas several years ago because the response to those events demonstrated the need for significant improvement. During Hurricane Ike, there were insufficient quantities of generators forced hospitals to evacuate patients. Local governments waited days for commodities like ice, water, MREs, and blue tarps. Evacuees from Texas arrived in Shreveport and Bastrop shelters that were grossly unfit for occupancy, and 2,500 people were forced to use the same shower facility.

Emergency preparedness is not the exclusive responsibility of the Federal Government or individual agencies within it. State and local officials, nonprofit organizations, private sector businesses, and individual citizens must all contribute to the mission in order for our nation to succeed at protecting life and property from disasters. Recovery and mitigation are critical to protecting communities from future threats, and our ability to respond will suffer if we do not focus attention and resources on those missions.

My fervent prayer is that Texas and the nation will be spared the wrath of another devastating storm this hurricane season, but we cannot avert disaster indefinitely. By continually testing, evaluating, and improving our emergency response capabilities, we increase the possibility that we as a nation may one day answer the question "Are we ready?" with a resounding "Yes." That is the purpose to which we will dedicate our efforts here today and for the foreseeable future.

Since the terrorist attack in Boston, Massachusetts, this Nation has recognized how remote threats and distant trouble can pose near and present dangers to our shores. We have learned as a nation that we must maintain a constant, capable, and vigilant posture to protect ourselves against new threats and evolving hazards. But we have also learned that vigilance and protection are not ends in and of themselves, but rather necessary tools in the service of our national purpose. Just as today's threats to our national security and strategic interests are evolving and interdependent, so too must our efforts to ensure the security of our homeland reflect these same characteristics.

As we develop new capabilities and technologies, our adversaries will seek to evade them, as was shown by the attempted terrorist attack on Flight 253 on December 25, 2009. We must constantly work to stay ahead of our adversaries. Among the forces that threaten the United States and its interests are those that blend the lethality and high-tech capabilities of modern weaponry with the power and opportunity of asymmetric tactics such as terrorism and cyber warfare. We are challenged not only by novel employment of conventional weaponry, but also by the hybrid nature of these threats. Countering such threats requires us to adapt traditional roles and responsibilities across the national security spectrum and craft solutions that leverage the capabilities that exists both inside and outside of government.

The attempted terrorist attack on Flight 253 on December 25, 2009, powerfully illustrates that terrorists will go to great lengths to try to defeat the security measures that have been put in place since 9/11.

More specifically, the threats and hazards that challenge U.S. interests from a homeland security perspective include:

High-consequence weapons of mass destruction (WMD), in particular, improvised nuclear devices and high-consequence biological weapons, which would have the greatest potential effects if used against the United States. We know that non-state actors actively seek to acquire, build, and use such weapons and technologies, and that foreign states continue to develop high-consequence weaponry with the intent to intimidate or blackmail the international community and proliferate to other potentially hostile state or non-state actors.

Dangerous materials, technology, and knowledge circulate with ease in our globalized economy and are controlled unevenly around the world, raising the possibility of theft or accidental use and making it difficult to track and prevent proliferation.

Al-Qaeda and global violent extremism, which directly threaten the United States and its allies. Terrorist networks exploit gaps in governance and security within both weak and advanced states. Some terrorist organizations benefit from active state-sponsorship and from the failure of other states to counter known terrorist organizations or sources of support within their borders. Terrorist organizations have expressed the intent to employ mass-casualty WMD as well as smaller scale attacks against prominent political, economic, and infrastructure targets in the United States and around the world.

High-consequence and/or wide-scale cyber attacks, intrusions, disruptions, and exploitations, which, when used by hostile state or non-state actors, could massively disable or impair critical international financial, commercial, physical, and other infrastructure. This in turn could cripple the global movement of people and goods worldwide and bringing legitimate and vital social and economic processes to a standstill. These cyber attacks involve individuals and groups who conduct intrusions in search of information to use against the United States, and those who spread malicious code in an attempt to disrupt the national information infrastructure.

Pandemics, major accidents, and natural hazards, which can result in massive loss of life and livelihood equal to or greater than many deliberate malicious attacks. Certain public health threats, such as disease outbreaks and natural hazards (e.g., hurricanes and floods), occur organically. Others can be introduced into the United States through the movement of people and goods across our borders.

Illicit trafficking and related transnational crime, which can undermine effective governance and security, corrupt strategically vital markets, slow economic growth, and destabilize weaker states. Transnational crime and trafficking facilitate the movement of narcotics, people, funds, arms, and other support to hostile actors, including terrorist networks. Importantly for the American homeland, the dramatic detrimental effect of illegal trafficking and transnational criminal organizations is apparent in societies within the Western Hemisphere.

Smaller scale terrorism, which may include violent extremists and other state or non-state actors conducting small-scale explosive and cyber attacks and intrusions against population centers, important symbolic targets, or critical infrastructure.

In addition to these specific threats and hazards, America's national interests are also

threatened by global challenges and long-term trends. These include:

Economic and financial instability that can undermine confidence in the international order, fuel global political turbulence, and induce social and political instability in weak states abroad.

Dependence on fossil fuels and the threat of global climate change that can open the United States to disruptions and manipulations in energy supplies and to changes in our natural environment on an unprecedented scale. Climate change is expected to increase the severity and frequency of weather-related hazards, which could, in turn, result in social and political destabilization, international conflict, or mass migrations.

Mr. Speaker, on any given day the City of Houston faces a widespread and ever-changing array of threats, including terrorism, organized crime, natural disasters and industrial accidents.

With an increasingly vast array of enforcement issues at hand, including "arms trafficking, identity theft, environmental crime, money laundering, theft of cultural property, drug trafficking, crimes against women and children, organ trafficking" and cybercrime, it is increasingly clear that coordinated, strategic criminal intelligence must be employed, bringing together diverse agencies and employees in the fight against serious and organized crime. Cybercrime, especially, will only continue to increase as globalization fosters higher levels of digital interconnectivity.

Every day, ensuring the security of the homeland requires the interaction of multiple Federal departments and agencies, as well as operational collaboration across Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector. This collaboration and cooperation undergirds our security posture at our borders and ports, our preparedness in our communities, and our ability to effectively react to crises.

I believe it is important to acknowledge the efforts and commitment of the men and women who are our law enforcement personnel, first responders, emergency managers, and other homeland security professionals not only in our home State, but also across the country who have worked tirelessly to make this Nation secure.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I note the Administration strongly opposes House passage of piecemeal fiscal year 2014 appropriations legislation that restores only very limited activities.

I agree that consideration of appropriations bills in this fashion is not a serious or responsible way to run the United States Government. Instead of opening up a few Government functions, the House of Representatives should re-open all of the Government.

The harmful impacts of a shutdown extend across Government, affecting services that are critical to small businesses, women, children, seniors, and others across the Nation.

The Senate acted in a responsible manner on a short-term funding measure to maintain Government functions and avoid a damaging Government shutdown.

We should settle our differences and allow a straight up or down vote on the Senate-passed H.J. Res. 59.

Mr. CARTER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, does the gentleman have additional speakers?

Mr. CARTER. No, I don't believe so.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of attending the annual awards dinner of the Partnership for Public Service, the so-called Sammies Award. These are awards that are given each year to outstanding public servants.

Last night's awardees had touching, inspiring stories of the work they had done within the Centers for Disease Control in polio eradication, the National Institutes of Health, the Center for Missing and Exploited Children—an agency we know very well in Homeland Security. The Central Intelligence Agency, story after story of devoted public service—public service, I must say, that has taken place in recent years in an atmosphere where public service is often denigrated and public servants often have their pay frozen by virtue of the budget nonsense of the sort we are witnessing here this week.

Half of those awardees last night were on furlough. What a disgrace. What a commentary on the honor that we should be paying to those who serve our country so well. So we're asking today, it would take about 30 minutes; there would be a bipartisan majority easily in this body for ending this shutdown and opening the Federal Government.

And on the issues before us—the budget, health care, whatever—you know, you live to fight another day. But we have no business in this body demanding a ransom for doing our basic job, which is to keep the lights on, keep the government running, and to pay our country's bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to the continuing appropriations resolution, H.J. Res. 59. Enough is enough. We must get our people back to work and bring services to the people of this country. Enough is enough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean continuing resolution, and go to conference on a budget so that we

can end this Republican government shutdown that is undermining public health by preventing the CDC from working on its annual flu vaccine or detecting disease outbreaks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend.

As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. In brief closing, Mr. Speaker, we have a storm coming toward our shores. We need to get this done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 85, a bill which claims to fund operations at the Federal Emergency Management Agency, but in reality is a piecemeal approach to funding government operations in order to score political points.

Let me be clear, I support FEMA and appreciate greatly the dedicated men and women who work on behalf of FEMA, but I do not support this bill because, in the end, it does more harm than good.

I believe the proper way to fund FEMA is for Congress to fulfill its constitutional responsibility and pass regular appropriations bills. The House passed a full year funding bill for DHS in June that would provide \$40.1 billion more for DHS than the bill before us today.

Using a piecemeal approach to fund selected programs within an agency neglects other important programs within that same agency. In this case, supporting H.J. Res. 85 funds FEMA at the expense of the Secret Service, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Office of Disaster Assistance at the Small Business Administration.

The fact is that by taking up the Senate's clean continuing resolution and sending it to the President for his signature tonight, we can fund FEMA, DHS and all the other important programs and services of the government. That is why I call on my colleagues to bring up the Senate CR so we can end this shut down and get all our federal workers back on the job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. In its current form I am, yes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bishop of New York moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 85 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of New York (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit would allow a vote on H.J. Res. 59, the Senate continuing resolution. If we were to pass the continuing resolution, the entire Federal Government would reopen, not just an isolated slice of it. All we're asking for is a vote on the Senate resolution.

I would ask: Is not taking a vote on issues of great importance to our country the very essence of our democracy? And I would further ask what it is that our friends on the majority are afraid of in terms of allowing such a vote to happen on the floor of this House?

Mr. Speaker, Tropical Storm Karen is bearing down on the gulf as we speak. It is expected to be upgraded to at least a category 1 hurricane and could reach my district along the east coast as soon as Tuesday of next week.

We're still picking up the pieces from Sandy, and we can't afford to be hit by another storm. Have we forgotten the lessons of Katrina? of Sandy, which clobbered the shores of New York and New Jersey?

If we are funding FEMA, why aren't we providing funds for every single agency so that human lives can be protected and storm damage taken care of immediately? These storms require all hands on deck, and yet 800,000 employees are currently furloughed.

After Sandy took eight lives, destroyed thousands of homes, and shut down dozens of businesses in my district, my district needed much more than just FEMA. We needed the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Interior, not to mention the Army Corps of Engineers and the Small Business Administration, to name just a few of the agencies that joined together in the coordinated recovery effort to deliver emergency relief and to begin the rebuilding process.

Why are the Republicans in favor of closing down the Federal Government

and denying taxpayers the protections from natural disasters that they've already paid for? This makes absolutely no sense to people who have to work hard every day to make a living and are now concerned that they are in the path of an oncoming storm.

I just want to raise one point about how destructive this government shutdown has been. I have just come from a meeting of the Board of Visitors of the United States Merchant Marines Academy—one of the four service academies that each Member of this Congress has the honor to nominate outstanding young men and women to be able to attend. That service academy right now is closed, it is shut down. No classes are being offered. So we have nominated the cream of the crop that this country has to offer to this academy, and they are attending a school which cannot schedule and hold classes. This is madness. This is madness. And the capacity to change that is right here within our grasp. It's called H.J. Res. 59.

Let's schedule a vote on that and let's see what happens. I'll bet that if we do have a vote on H.J. Res. 59 it will pass, we'll be able to send it to the President, and he will sign it. And we'll be able to reopen the government within hours.

So I would urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in this motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As the Chair has recently ruled on October 2 and 3, 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard on the point or order?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I do, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I would just raise a couple of questions.

The first is, the bill before us funds a slice of the Federal Government. What I am struggling to understand is why funding the entire Federal Government would be out of order and not germane, when it is germane to schedule or to fund a piece of the Federal Government? It strikes me as illogical in the extreme that it is in order to fund a piece of the Federal Government, but not in order to fund the entire Federal Government. I would ask the Chair to explain why it is that the motion to recommit would not be germane.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia seek to be heard on the point or order?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. This should be ruled germane because we have to look to see where we are in the process.

If the point of order had not been raised, the next order of business would have been the motion to recommit, which would open up all of government.

He has made the point of order, and the Speaker has indicated the previous rulings have been to sustain the point of order. And if the normal course takes place, the next motion will be to appeal the ruling of the Chair. If that motion were to prevail, if we were to sustain the appeal of the Chair—not table it, but sustain it—we would in effect make the motion to recommit in order and we can finally get an up-or-down vote on keeping the government open.

So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the ruling would be that we would forego all of that and just let us have an up-or-down vote on keeping the government open without having to overrule the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas makes the point or order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from New York are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House relating to other funding.

As the Chair ruled on October 2 and October 3, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds because such motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure.

Therefore, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-

minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 185, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Gowdy	Perry
Amash	Granger	Petri
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Pitts
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Pompeo
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Posey
Barr	Grimm	Price (GA)
Barton	Guthrie	Radel
Benishek	Hall	Reed
Bentivolio	Hanna	Reichert
Billirakis	Harper	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Ribble
Black	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Rigell
Boustany	Heck (NV)	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rokita
Bucshon	Hunter	Rooney
Burgess	Hurt	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Issa	Roskam
Camp	Jenkins	Ross
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Capito	Jordan	Runyan
Carter	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scalise
Coble	Kingston	Schock
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Cole	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Sessions
Conaway	Lamborn	Shimkus
Cook	Lance	Shuster
Cotton	Lankford	Simpson
Cramer	Latham	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Latta	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Long	Smith (TX)
Daines	Lucas	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Denham	Marchant	Stivers
Dent	Marino	Stockman
DeSantis	Massie	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McCauley	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McClintock	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Turner
Ellmers	McKinley	Upton
Farenthold	McMorris	Valadao
Fincher	Rodgers	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walberg
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walden
Fleming	Messer	Walorski
Flores	Mica	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Fox	Mullin	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gardner	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Noem	Wittman
Gerlach	Nugent	Wolf
Gibbs	Nunes	Womack
Gibson	Nunnelee	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Olson	Yoder
Gohmert	Palazzo	Yoho
Goodlatte	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Gosar	Pearce	Young (IN)

NAYS—185

Andrews	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Barber	Braley (IA)	Castor (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Brown (FL)	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Chu
Becerra	Bustos	Cicilline
Bera (CA)	Butterfield	Clarke
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Clay
Bishop (NY)	Capuano	Cleaver
Blumenauer	Carney	Clyburn
Bonamici	Carson (IN)	Cohen

Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating

Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napoliitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter

NOT VOTING—22

Bass
Cárdenas
DeGette
Garcia
Grayson
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins

Jones
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pittenger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sires

□ 1626

Ms. SCHWARTZ and Ms. DELAURIO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 164, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

YEAS—247

Aderholt
Amash

Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Murphy (FL)
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)

Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishiek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Elmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger

Andrews
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry

NAYS—164

Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo

Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren

Bass
Cárdenas
DeGette
Grayson
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins

Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napoliitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond

Jones
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pittenger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta

NOT VOTING—20

□ 1633

So the joint resolution was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making continuing appropriations for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 75

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Domestic Food Programs—Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of the Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.J. Res. 75, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon in support of H.J. Res. 75, which would continue funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, or commonly known as the WIC program.

The fiscal year 2013 Agriculture appropriations bill provided sufficient funding, even after sequestration, totaling \$6.5 billion, to ensure that all participants receive both nutritious food and the nutrition services that are necessary for their health and their well-being.

Before the United States Department of Agriculture completely shut down its Web site, information could be found on their Web site stating that short-term funding was available for WIC through the contingency reserve fund, carryover funds, and other available resources.

While some States have indicated they have sufficient funds to at least work several more weeks, other States are not so fortunate. Many of us have seen headlines, perhaps received phone calls into our offices from constituents who have reported that their appointment at their local WIC clinic has been canceled or that clinics are being closed. Numerous times we have heard our colleagues across the aisle mention that WIC cannot continue without an appropriation for fiscal year 2014, and this will leave millions of women, infants, and children without proper nutrition.

Now is a chance, Madam Speaker, for my colleagues to join us in keeping this important program fully functioning and operational. By passing the resolution that we have on the floor this afternoon, we will help 8.7 million low-income women, infants, and children who are nutritionally at risk to continue to receive the nutrition they need. This resolution will keep WIC clinics across the Nation open. No more appointments will have to be canceled.

I believe that every Member of this House of Representatives believes that WIC participants need and should get the participation they need, and I would ask my colleagues to support this resolution, that we supply ade-

quate nutrition for women, infants, and children as we move forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to this piecemeal approach of funding our government. I am the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

The bill dealing with all of those issues is on the House floor. We did our job, as the chairman so eloquently spoke about. The committee fulfilled its commitment to review the whole budget. We passed H.R. 2410 out of committee and even adopted a rule to bring it to the floor in June, but we didn't move the bill because the timing with the now-expired farm bill wanted to hold everything off.

I'm just wondering, Madam Speaker, when is the House going to announce its conferees on the farm bill? The Senate has done it not once, but twice. If we had a conference, we could be bringing up the full bill and not just this piecemeal—let's take a little bit of this that we like and that that we like and do what I call this menu of choice, which, if you're not on that menu, everything is out.

Nobody can challenge my support on WIC. I mean, I am a returning Peace Corps volunteer. If there's anybody that got training on the need for feeding women, infants, and children in this Congress, it's my experience in living in a poor barrio in South America.

But this does nothing for the 48 million people who currently need food stamps, what we call the SNAP program. This does nothing for the rest of the kids and the family who may be hungry, going to school and can't get access to school lunch. This does nothing to open the door for Federal workers who help people in rural agriculture to produce the food. This bill does nothing to provide a remedy for rural areas like Colorado and California, who were just ravaged by floods and fires, to do the post-op cleanup and restoration to prevent floods from coming this winter. This does nothing for the farm service agency loan borrowers to help those that are needing loans to put their livestock or their grain or other commodities into the program that is going to be feeding the women, infants, and children. So just one little piece that they carve out and suggest that: Oh, Congress, do this.

I want you all to listen to this. Since I've been here since 1993, we've passed 111 CRs. Not one of them had this battle, had this conditionality, had this shutdown of government—none of them. Why now? What's different? You want to take away the President's health care bill. That was enacted 3½ years ago. You passed a CR the year it was adopted. You passed a CR after it was adopted. You passed a CR after that. What is it?

Let's stop being so mean and so broken about the ability to keep our government open.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, Chairman ROGERS.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in full support of H.J. Res. 75. This bill ensures that the nearly 8.7 million women, infants, and children who rely on the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children will continue to receive critical nutrition assistance without interruption.

□ 1645

This bill provides funding for WIC at the fiscal year 2013 post-sequester rate of \$6.5 billion until December 15, or until we can enact full-year appropriations legislation. That is the ultimate goal of this bill, Madam Speaker, to move us closer to ending this government shutdown by providing regular appropriations for all government programs. To achieve that, we've got to have an adult conversation about what this might entail and how we can get there.

And I've got a great suggestion, Madam Speaker. Monday night, the House passed an amendment to the CR over to the Senate and asked for a conference with the Senate. Then the Speaker named House conferees.

Now the normal traditions of this body, as all of us know, is that when the House and the Senate pass differing versions of the same bill, how do we resolve the difference? Well, we appoint conferees. We have some House Members and some Senate Members that are selected by their respective leaders. And they go up, and they argue and debate and amend. And they come up with an agreement that they then bring back to each body for approval, and that becomes the law.

That procedure is in play right now. I mean, the House has appointed conferees. We've got a table arranged downstairs for the Senators to join us in resolving the shutdown. And what does the Senate do? What do we hear from the Senate? A big loud snore, that they're not willing to come to the table and talk. Just talk. We may not be able to agree. But we can talk and try to work it out for the American people.

And as we work this out, we've got to be sure that our most vulnerable citizens don't fall victim to politics. This bill will take care of those who count on WIC to meet their nutritional needs—our women, our infants, our children. Because this language was essentially included in my original initial clean continuing resolution, I endorse it today. This House, I think, should support it today.

But our colleagues in the Senate should also support it. This would be the seventh bill we've sent them to help reopen the Federal Government in the last 3 days. The seventh bill. We've heard nothing from them. Altogether,

these bills provide nearly a third of the discretionary funding that's needed to operate the entire Federal Government. So in the last 3 days, we've passed bills to fund a third of the government.

The Senate keeps demanding from us, and yet they won't vote on these bills that would be a part of that clean CR. The math just doesn't add up, Madam Speaker.

Though this piecemeal funding approach is not my preferred mechanism to move forward, it does move us incrementally forward. I would rather we fund the government with regular appropriations bills, so-called regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield the chairman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. This House passed four of those regular bills this year. Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol passed none. For all of their talk on the other side of the Capitol about returning to regular order, it seems the Senate has made very little action to achieve that goal. We're in this mess today in part because of that. But passing this bill will help us get out of it.

So I urge my colleagues to support an end to this shutdown with this WIC program, support this bill, and pass it today.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. NITA LOWEY, the ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the reckless Republican shutdown.

WIC services are vital to new mothers and their children, and Democrats have long been strong supporters. In fact, it is puzzling to me that Republicans today claim to be so supportive of WIC when, just 4 months ago, they proposed to deprive over 200,000 women and infants WIC benefits.

Funding one budget item at a time, even one as important as the WIC program, does nothing to help children get immunizations or help working families find child care. Republicans are just disconnected from reality.

This bill is nothing more than a Republican ploy. Madam Speaker, as my friends know very well, we could end the Republican shutdown today if the majority would only allow a vote on the Senate-passed bill, which includes the funding levels that Republicans wrote, the funding levels of the Republicans. That was the negotiation. That was the discussion. The Democrats agreed to the Republican funding levels. And that would be signed by the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentlewoman from New York an additional 20 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. If you really care about the mothers and infants who

benefit from this program, you should vote "no" on this bill and demand that the Republican leadership allow the House to vote on the Senate bill to immediately end this reckless Republican shutdown.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), one of the members of our Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 75, the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act.

This bill would continue funding until December for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, commonly referred to as WIC. Across the country, over 8.9 million moms and kids under the age of 5 are living near or below the poverty line and depend on supplemental vouchers by the WIC program to purchase healthy food.

The WIC program is especially important to my constituents in the Central Valley of California. My district suffers from 14 percent unemployment. That's almost double the national average. Some regions of my district are suffering from more than 30 percent unemployment, making it nearly impossible for many mothers to find work, despite their best efforts, so that they may provide for their families.

Congress must put aside partisan politics and come together, working across party lines to pass this critical legislation so that mothers in California's Central Valley and across the entire country can continue to feed their children.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the congressman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), ranking member of the Education & the Workforce Committee.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, Congress should reopen the Federal Government in its entirety and not continue to hold the Federal Government and the American people hostage. The fact is, by closing the Federal Government, Republicans in the House are jeopardizing critical services for mothers and their children. They should have realized this when they shut down the entire Federal Government.

It is not enough just to restore one set of services for women, infants, and children, like the WIC program, but not to fund food stamps or income assistance or housing vouchers, for example, which the same mothers and children rely on to hold their families together. This is literally taking food out of the mouths of children.

Republicans are taking a lot of heat for closing down the government, so they want to open up one part or another to relieve the pressure under

them. But this doesn't help these families. This doesn't help these families because they're cutting other resources and services to these families.

Republicans should allow the House to vote on a bill to open up the whole Federal Government, and then we can sit down and talk about what the budget will look like for the rest of the year.

They should stop trying to kill the new health care law that will help some of these very same families that depend upon WIC. And they should stop picking winners and losers based upon the political realities out there that the American public is getting angrier and angrier at how they're treating the recipients of Federal assistance in this country today.

I urge people to vote against this legislation.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), the chair of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I certainly thank my colleague for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in very, very strong support of the Nutrition Assistance for Low-Income Women and Children Act.

You know, much of the controversy that's been surrounding this government shutdown has really been focused on ObamaCare. We keep talking about ObamaCare, et cetera. But this bill that we are considering right now has absolutely nothing to do with ObamaCare. Nothing. The only thing at issue in this bill is will we help provide supplemental nutrition programs for American mothers, their babies, and their children, period. That is the issue before us today.

Now I know that many of my friends on the other side, Madam Speaker, are going to say that they oppose this legislation because they need to have an entire government funding bill or nothing at all. And I would just note, when they say that each and every time, they then accuse us of being absolutists. But they will not accept anything, except an entire government funding bill. I also know that many on the other side of the aisle will look to their hearts and will support this bill. And we will pass this bill with very strong bipartisan support.

I certainly hope that the leaders in the Senate will look as well at the very broad bipartisan support that we will have for this bill and that they will take it to heart as well and take it up.

Madam Speaker, more than half the babies that are born in my great State of Michigan are enrolled in the WIC program, and currently, the State of Michigan is only able to sustain this program for the next few weeks.

I would ask my colleagues, again, to look to your heart, look to your heart. We're not talking about defunding ObamaCare or anything like that. We are talking about women and their

children and their babies. I would hope that we can join together today across the aisle, pass this bill, and see to it that mothers and infants and children in Michigan and all across America get the support that they need.

Mr. FARR. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the former ranking member of the Ag Appropriations Committee and now the ranking member of the Health and Human Services Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this cruel political game the majority is playing this afternoon. Since they took office, this Republican majority has repeatedly tried to slash the women, infants, and children feeding program—2011, 2012, 2013.

I sit on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. This past summer, on a party-line vote, the Republican members on the committee who have just gotten up to speak to you voted to slash the WIC program and take nutritious food from over 200,000 pregnant mothers and infants. I introduced an amendment to restore this critical funding, and the Republican majority shut it down.

When it mattered, when we all voted, the Republican majority cut this funding. And now they're trying to use low-income families for a political message. This is disingenuous, this is duplicitous, and it is shameful.

Last month, on a party-line vote, they took food stamps from over 4 million low-income families, seniors, veterans, and children.

□ 1700

Are we meant to believe that today they have come to Jesus?

Or is it just politics?

I have strongly supported the Women, Infants and Children feeding program my entire career; and when I served as chair of the Ag Appropriations Subcommittee, the Democrats funded WIC at record levels, expanded it as the need arose during a recession.

We are talking about people's lives. This majority chose to shut the government down, and families all across this country are being affected. Furloughed workers, small businesses, and families cannot get loans. Biomedical and scientific research has stopped.

Food safety, food banks, flu tracking, Federal economic reports, immunizations—they have been stopped because of what the Republican majority is doing here.

The gamesmanship is heartless; it's offensive. The government has been shut down now for 4 days.

Do not use hungry families as political pawns. It's time to stop these bills, fund the government, reopen it. And I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of

the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Speaker, I've got to tell you, this is remarkable. I hear a passionate speech from the gentlelady from Connecticut, and I hear my friends across the aisle applauding?

We're here to provide funding for 9 million women and children because we're here to provide funding for people who are in need of help and aid. And when we're here to do the work of the people, that you applaud and say, no, I don't want that money to go to them? That's wrong.

We may not agree on a lot of things, but there are things that we agree on, and this is one of them. And to applaud and say that we don't want to provide this funding for women and children?

I have six kids of my own. There are people in need in my community. And for my friends to say no to that and applaud a speech saying do not vote to help our women and children in America, that's wrong.

Listen, we have a shutdown right now. Why?

Everyone in this Chamber is in ObamaCare. In America, we are in ObamaCare. All we've asked for is that Barack Obama and the administration join America and this institution in ObamaCare. That's what we've asked for.

We know that Big Business and the lobbyists came to Washington, D.C., and they said, give us a 1-year exemption from the tax. Give us an exemption. And Mr. President, he said, okay, Big Business, I'll give it to you.

All we've said is, Mr. President, treat the individuals in America the same way you're treating Big Business—equality, fairness. If it's good for the American people, if it's good for this institution, it is good for Mr. CARNEY and President Barack Obama and their administration.

Let's all join this together. Let's hold hands. Let's all join ObamaCare, but let's not treat one group of people differently than the rest of us.

Join us, Mr. President.

Let's open up this government. Let's bring the President in, and let's treat the individuals the same as the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, we've passed 111 CRs without any of this rhetoric. There are no excuses. They have all been clean.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to yet another disingenuous legislative charade by my Republican colleagues to appear

as if they are doing something about their unnecessary government shutdown.

The fact is, Republicans can open the government today by bringing a clean continuing resolution to the floor. Instead, Republicans are targeting the WIC program to try and fool the American people into believing they are concerned about the painful effects of their government shutdown.

The National WIC Association sees through this charade and is urging Members of Congress to oppose the bill, calling it “a cynical ploy to use low-income, nutritionally at-risk mothers, and young children as political pawns for political ends.”

The NWA also stated it has sufficient operating funds through October and “will not tolerate efforts to leverage the nutritional health and well-being of pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, their babies and young children to satisfy the political ends or strategies of policymakers.”

I could not agree more. I urge my colleagues to heed their words and vote “no” on this bill.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for the time.

Madam Speaker, yesterday, I introduced legislation that would ensure the Women, Infants and Children nutrition program remains funded during a government shutdown. Today, I’m very grateful to my colleagues for swift action to fund this important program.

In Arkansas, WIC benefits 42,000 kids, 24,000 infants, and 2,000 moms. Fortunately, the Arkansas Department of Health reached an agreement earlier this week with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to fund the WIC program, though only on a week-to-week basis.

Moms and kids shouldn’t suffer because Senate Democrats have shut down the government to protect their special perks and political allies, because that is what has happened here, Madam Speaker.

The House of Representatives, earlier this week, passed a continuing resolution that would fund the government, to include funding, in part, for ObamaCare; and we asked that the Senate Democrats only accept two simple principles: that the White House and Congress follow the same ObamaCare rules as the rest of America and that if Barack Obama is going to give big businesses a 1-year break from ObamaCare, then families and workers should get the same 1-year break.

But Senate Democrats refused to fund the government with those simple terms, the terms that Congress should follow the laws they impose on the American people, and that workers and family should get the same breaks as businesses.

Now, I know there’s many important pieces of legislation in front of the Senate today. For instance, they ear-

lier passed a resolution calling next week National Chess Week. Now, that’s obviously an urgent matter for this country. But women and kids in need shouldn’t be political pawns in the Senate’s game.

So I say to the Senate, let’s put aside partisanship and pass this legislation for the kids, just as we did earlier this week for the troops.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Berkeley, California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first I rise in strong opposition to this bill, but I just have to say what nerve the Republicans have to bring this bill to the floor.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have witnessed Republicans vote over and over again to cut funding for the Women, Infants and Children’s program. In the past year alone, they have cut \$500 million, which cuts, in my district alone, 21,000 participants. But let me tell you, they have refused in committee to listen, and they have insisted on these massive cuts.

Now, today, they are pretending, pretending that they care about the WIC program with this cynical ploy. It is simply outrageous to play politics with pregnant women and their children. What nerve.

Republicans are now trying to pretend that they want to reopen government that they shut down, using our most vulnerable as pawns. It is hard to believe what I’m hearing today from Republicans about their support for nutrition assistance for women and children, when, in the Appropriations Committee, they say and they vote just the opposite.

How hypocritical can they get?

Americans are not fooled. They want the government, the entire government, open.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. FARR. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. They want us to shut down the shutdown that the Tea Party extremists shamefully created. We can reopen the government today, right now, on a bipartisan basis, if Republicans would allow a vote on the bill that would reopen the government.

So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this shameful bill and insist on a vote to open the entire government up. The American people deserve that.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a great Rules Committee member.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, there are nearly 50 million people who are hungry in this country. Seventeen million of them are children, and because we are still emerging from this difficult economy, hunger is not getting better in America. The only rea-

son why people aren’t starving is because of the essential safety net programs that we have put in place.

For months and months and months and months, we have seen the Republicans in this House try to gut the SNAP program, try to slash funding for WIC, and for school lunches and for Meals on Wheels. And now, today, we’re supposed to believe that they are champions for hungry kids? Today they want us to believe that they care about poor people?

Please. This charade is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. It is a cynical ploy that won’t feed a single pregnant mother or won’t provide formula to a single needy infant. It’s going nowhere. It is a stunt. It’s legislating by press release, and it’s shameful.

We should pass a clean CR and reject this woefully inadequate bill and try to end hunger in America. Do not treat poor women and children as political pawns. It is not right, and you know it is not right.

We have an obligation to our most vulnerable neighbors. This fails that test, and it fails that test badly.

Pass a clean CR. Do your job. This is cynical.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished doctor from Seattle, Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) of the Ways and Means Committee.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, the Republican Caucus is standing out here naked, and they keep bringing fig leaves out to cover themselves. This is another fig leaf. It is not intended to do anything.

At the end of the Second World War, it was determined that 43 percent of the people who were drafted were unfit for military service because of nutritional deficiencies. We have, as a public policy, from that point onward, fed people at every level. School lunches, Head Start, WIC program, SNAP—they have all been designed for making this a healthy country.

One of my colleagues says, well, this has nothing to do with ObamaCare. It has everything to do with ObamaCare. If you don’t feed kids the proper things, they get sick. Everybody knows that, apparently, except the Republican caucus, Madam Speaker.

The fact is that what we need to do is bring out a clean resolution and reopen the government and feed all the people. This business about picking one group that’s entitled to a little something and leaving some others out is absolutely cynical beyond belief, and it should not happen in this place.

We have the ability to have the most healthy people in the world. We produce food, we ship it everywhere, and yet you hear from my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, how many people are

hungry in this country because they don't have it.

Now, somehow you think a mother's going to sit there, she's got her stuff from the WIC program, right? She's got a kid that's 1 year old and one that's 3 and one that's 7, and she's going to say to the 3 and the 7-year-old, you don't get anything; but I've got a little something for your brother Johnny?

What kind of situation is this? Do you understand what it's like to be deprived in this country?

We can do better than this. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves for this cynical fig leaf.

I urge you to vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), another member of our Subcommittee on Agriculture for Appropriations.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, for his leadership.

To what lengths will the Democrats go in order to protect ObamaCare? They've already denied pay to National Guardsmen and -women and Reservists, ceased lifesaving medical research. They've stopped VA benefits. Yet these measures have passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support.

Now, will they deny food to women, infants and children?

□ 1715

The Democratic colleagues in the House that support this measure, maybe they can talk to their friends and get them to support it as well.

This morning, a key White House official gloated and said, "We're winning." Madam Speaker, this is not a game. Those men and women in the Guard and the Reserves that have been furloughed don't think this is a game. Those awaiting lifesaving medical research and treatment don't think anyone is winning. Those veterans who are waiting in line because they cannot apply for the benefits that they have earned don't think this is a game. And the women, infants, and children that are awaiting food under this bill know this is not a game.

It's time to end this charade. Let's pass this bill and then invite our colleagues in the Senate to come to the table and talk.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, for 111 times we've voted for CRs to feed everybody, not just a few.

I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin, GWEN MOORE.

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, today's consideration of H.J. Res. 75 is a sham, a masquerade, a charade, and it features this relentless drumbeat and parade of pretentious concern for suckling babes and lactating women.

Who do you think you're fooling? You're not fooling the National WIC Association. After all, they have watched the Appropriations Committee of this majority vote out up to half a billion dollars in cuts in the WIC program for these 8.6 million suckling babes.

And what of these lactating women? I breastfed my kids; and I tell you that when you cut \$40 billion out of food stamps, women cannot produce milk because they won't have fresh fruits and vegetables and lean meats.

And what about the siblings of these children—school-age children who are the 210,000 who rely on free lunch that this bill does not address?

Madam Speaker, I would hope that we would not deny 859,000 children, elderly, and disabled. Enough of this carnival. Let's get off this merry-go-round and reject this chicanery.

Mr. ADERHOLT. At this time I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, the word "hypocrisy" has been thrown around a lot tonight.

I got to Congress about 3 years ago, and my understanding was if you were Republican, you hated women, infants, children, veterans, and seniors.

This week, we have tried to address the problems of women, infants, children, veterans, and seniors. For some reason, our colleagues can't understand that because they say, You are using these people as political pawns.

And the hypocrisy of it is they no longer can stand up when they say that they defend these folks because they have turned their backs on them this week; and instead of helping them, they have turned a cold shoulder.

When I was a child growing up, I used to make a list every night when it came close to Christmas of everything that I wanted, and I'd wake up Christmas morning and I never got everything I wanted, but boy, was I glad for everything I got.

If you're telling me tonight that you are turning your back on the same people that you say only your party defends, that is the height of hypocrisy. It's totally uncalled for on this floor.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished Congresswoman from Florida, KATHY CASTOR.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of 1,500 of my neighbors in Tampa who have been furloughed at MacDill Air Force Base due to the GOP government shutdown. They were laid off on Tuesday, and they will not be paid.

I'm very proud of my community. The banks, credit unions, and the

Tampa Bay Partnership are coming together to ensure they have bridge loans so the families stay afloat. But it should have not come to this. It is so irresponsible for the GOP to shut down the government because they disagree with a duly enacted law.

I also rise on behalf of small businesses in my community. They are stymied from their expansion plans because the GOP has shut down the Small Business Administration. They want to buy equipment or get working capital, but the Republicans have shut them down.

I rise on behalf of the veterans in my community that were waiting for disability benefits; but due to the shutdown, they're going to have to wait longer.

And I rise on behalf of mothers, infants, and families all across this country in opposition to the Republicans' continued slashing of the basic sustenance that they need to keep going. This is not consistent with our American values.

This dysfunction is irresponsible, and it's causing real pain. I urge my colleagues to set aside the political gimmicks, allow a vote on the bill that will get people back to work, and end this GOP shutdown before it causes greater pain.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BARBER. Madam Speaker, enough is enough. We must end this reckless government shutdown.

I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to the continuing appropriations resolution, H.J. Res. 59.

We must end this blame game. We must come together and put the American people first. Enough is enough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) a distinguished Member with a great deal of seniority and probably the most knowledgeable Member in the Congress about all the health care issues in this country.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the people that we're talking about here tonight in this debate are people who work very hard and have a couple of children, usually, and need some help with their nutrition when they're pregnant, when their children are very young. Those folks have another problem, too. It's lack of health insurance.

A lot of them have worked their whole lives. They have worked for a

small business. They made just a little bit too much money for Medicaid, but not nearly enough to pay \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year for a health insurance policy.

On Tuesday, for the first time in their lives, for many of them, there's a chance to do something about that. A great number could enroll in Medicaid—their whole families. Others were able to buy health insurance for \$10 or \$15 a week to cover themselves and their families.

This whole government shutdown is about shutting down that opportunity for them to buy health care. So all these crocodile tears tonight about these families, the reality is we wouldn't be having this debate if there wasn't a compulsion on the majority side of the aisle to kill the Affordable Care Act.

You are not going to be able to.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1¾ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I'm the last speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Many of us that have spoken here are appropriators. Our job is to bring 12 bills to this floor, 12 conference reports. We've done none. We've totally failed. We're not the first Congress to do that. We've had to pass 111 CRs in the 20 years that I've been here in Congress. None of them had these prerequisites that we've got to meet with the President, we've got to repeal something, we've got to defund something, we don't like this, we don't like that. In fact, as appropriators we know that the rules of this House don't allow us to legislate on appropriations bills.

So even these requests that everybody is making of what we ought to do have to take a waiver by the Rules Committee—waiver to our own House rules—to bring all this stuff up. And in the meantime, we've done nothing, and so the government shuts down because we haven't been responsible for that oath of office that we took here.

It didn't say just fund a part of government. Today, we have a choice out of 10 parts of government. It's your popular parts, your menu, your special. Well, I didn't come here for any Tea Party special. I came here for the whole government—the hundreds of thousands of parts that put together this incredible, wonderful government that we have the privilege of serving.

But I can't go and tell my colleagues to go vote for this, vote for that on conditionality of this and that. All those things violate our procedural rules, violate our history.

This institution is 113 sessions old. As I said, since I've been here, 111 times we've come to the point where we need to pass a CR. We've never done it like this.

Reject this piecemeal legislation, and let's get on with the business. Let's open up government.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to address a couple of issues that have come up during our discussion here this afternoon.

I've heard some of my colleagues across the aisle say they believe WIC has been underfunded. I do want to point out that all eligible participants are being served; and to my knowledge, no one has been turned away from the program.

The FY 13 Ag approps conference agreement provided more than \$7 billion for the WIC program. After sequestration and rescissions, the total equaled \$6.5 billion. At the end of FY 13, WIC had carryover funds, or remaining funds, totaling nearly \$300 million. Even with sequestration, WIC has been able to serve all eligible participants and still have funding left over for the end of the fiscal year by \$300 million. Clearly, the program has received sufficient funding, and we have certainly made sure that to be the case.

In closing today, I would hope that my colleagues would join me in support of this resolution. There's nothing cynical about what we're doing here. You can read the resolution. I have it right here. It simply continues to provide funding for the WIC program, and it provides certainty. It ensures that WIC clinics will be open, appointments will be kept, and food benefits will be provided.

There's nothing, again, cynical about this. The only thing that's cynical about this is if you decide to politicize this bill.

It's interesting that those who claim to be the defenders and supporters of this program are the very ones actually coming here this afternoon that are opposing the bill. My colleagues will have a chance to be cynical and vote "no," but I hope they will not turn their backs on providing certainty for low-income women and children. All we want to do is to keep the program fully operational and fully funded.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.J. Res. 75, a piece-meal mini-CR," which woefully underfunds Women-Infant-Children Program, or WIC as it is known through the end of the year.

Notwithstanding the issue of the majority refusing to allow a vote on a clean continuous resolution, and dealing with the deficit and the majority's refusal to accept Obamacare—which must be addressed—we cannot stop investing in children because they are the future of our country.

WIC is a federal assistance program for health care and nutrition of low-income pregnant women, breast-feeding women, and infants and children under the age of 5.

In my congressional district, 67 percent of children under the age of 4, or 41,300, are eli-

gible for WIC. This is the ninth highest district in the country.

Indeed, in a story in Houston Chronicle, a young Houston mother posed a very relevant question. She asked, "How am I going to feed my children?" Has it come to this Mr. Speaker? A mother in the United States of America has to worry about her children going hungry. This is an outrage.

In fact, in my state of Texas there are 971,000 WIC eligible children, the 7th highest in the nation.

Madam Speaker, you might be interested to know that the top 10 states in terms of WIC eligible women and children are:

Rank	State	% WIC Eligible	Number
1.	Mississippi	54	115,600
2.	Arkansas	53	103,800
3.	New Mexico	52	74,900
4.	Oklahoma	51	132,100
5.	West Virginia	50	52,000
6.	Louisiana	50	148,600
7.	Texas	49	971,000
8.	Tennessee	48	196,700
9.	Kentucky	47	132,000
10.	South Carolina	47	138,800

The Agriculture Department, which funds WIC, released \$100 million in contingency funds, out of the \$125 million on hand when the budget impasse began, and is working with states to distribute about \$280 million in unexpended funds left over from the 2013 fiscal year.

According to USDA, with these funds states should be able to continue to supply new and existing WIC participants only through the end of October.

Madam Speaker, you will be as disappointed as I was to learn that When I attempted to access more up-to-date statistics on the WIC Program, SNAP, and hunger, I was greeted by a message that said: "Due to the lapse in federal government funding, this website is not available."

The National WIC Association does not support this dishonest attempt by House Republicans to extricate themselves from the mess they created when they recklessly voted to shut down the government and harm our economy and wreak havoc on the lives of millions of Americans who provide and depend upon services and benefits critical to our nation.

According to the National WIC Association opposes this bill because it is "a cynical ploy to use low-income nutritionally at-risk mothers and young children as political pawns for political ends" and urges Congress:

to end the uncertainty that exists in our fiscal environment and the already challenged lives of vulnerable mothers and young children by responsibly discharging and fulfilling its moral obligations to the nation. We will not tolerate efforts to leverage the nutritional health and well-being of pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, their babies, and young children to satisfy the political ends or strategies of policy-makers.

Madam Speaker, if Congress fails to pass a "clean" continuing resolution before month's end, many WIC Programs across the nation will run out of operating funds and clinics will be forced to close their doors, turn participants away, and end benefits.

This would be unconscionable.

Normally I would be pleased to be here today to talk about the funding for this program, but this is different. What the majority is doing is playing games with the lives of real

people—real mothers and their children—struggling to get by in the real world.

WIC is the nation's premiere preventive public health nutrition program targeted at low-income mothers and young children who have or are at risk for developing nutrition-related diseases and disorders. Serving nearly 9 million mothers and young children, including 53 percent of all infants in the country, WIC provides nutrition education, breastfeeding education and support, referrals to medical and social services and a small nutritious food package.

Numerous studies show that WIC has been effective in improving health outcomes for its target populations.

For example, every dollar spent on a pregnant woman in WIC saves up to \$4.21 in Medicaid costs for her and her newborn because WIC reduces the risk for preterm birth and low birth-weight babies by 25 percent and 44 percent, respectively.

The average first year medical cost for a premature or low birth-weight baby is \$49,033 compared to \$4,551 for a baby born without complications.

Children on WIC are also more likely to consume key nutrients, receive immunizations on time, and have high cognitive development scores than their peers not participating in WIC. Recent studies in Los Angeles County and New York State have documented a reduction in obesity rates in the WIC child population over the past several years.

In light of these successes, it is no wonder that recent surveys indicate that WIC retains broad support across political, ideological, ethnic, and socio-economic lines in America. A bipartisan national survey of 1,000 likely November 2012 voters indicated nearly 3 in 4 Americans want WIC funding to remain the same or increase.

Because of increase emphasis by Congress and the WIC program, between 1998 and 2010 the breastfeeding rate in WIC has risen from 41.3 percent to 63.1 percent. According to one estimate, if 90 percent of U.S. mothers exclusively breastfed their infants to 6 months, the U.S. would save \$13 billion per year in medical expenses and prevent over 900 deaths annually.

Inadequate funding will have short-term and long-term consequences. In the short-term, mothers and young children cut from the program may go without healthy food or enough food.

In the long-term, healthy childhood growth and development may be hampered resulting in health and development problems that will have life-long physical, mental, and financial costs.

A full funding level for the WIC program would ensure that no eligible applicants are turned away; maintain current and anticipated WIC participation levels; assure adequate nutrition services and administration funding; respond adequately to economic forecasts of rising food cost inflation; and provide funds for nutrition services to maintain clinic staffing and competitive salaries.

For these reasons, we should be working to pass H.J. Res. 59 as amended by the Senate. That is the best way to keep faith with all persons who serve the American people as employees of the federal government, and the women and children who depend upon the WIC program.

USDA

Due to the lapse in federal government funding, this website is not available.

After funding has been restored, please allow some time for this website to become available again.

For information about available government services, visit usa.gov

To view U.S. Department of Agriculture Agency Contingency plans, visit: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/contingency-plans>

Message from the President to U.S. Government Employees

[From the Huffington Post, Oct. 4, 2013]

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN JEOPARDIZES WIC PROGRAM

(By Michael Rubinkam)

ALLENTOWN, PA. (AP)—Jacob Quick is a fat and happy 4-month-old with a big and expensive appetite. Like millions of other poor women, Jacob's mother relies on the federal Women, Infants and Children program to pay for infant formula—aid that is now jeopardized by the government shutdown.

Pennsylvania and other states say they can operate WIC at least through the end of October, easing fears among officials that it would run out of money within days. But advocates and others worry what will happen if the shutdown drags on beyond that.

"What's going to happen to my baby?" asked Jacob's mother, Cierra Schoeneberger, as she fed him a bottle of formula bought with her WIC voucher. "Am I going to have to feed him regular milk, or am I going to have to scrounge up the little bit of change I do have for formula or even baby food?"

WIC serves nearly 9 million mothers and young children, providing what advocates say is vital nutrition that poor families might otherwise be unable to afford.

Schoeneberger, for example, said her son goes through about \$40 worth of formula a week. "It's like a car payment," said the unemployed mother of three.

The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children—better known as WIC—supplies low-income women with checks or debit cards that can be used for infant formula and cereal, fruits and vegetables, dairy items and other healthy food. WIC also provides breast-feeding support and nutrition classes. Poor women with children under 5 are eligible.

Just before the shutdown, the U.S. Department of Agriculture had warned that states would run out of WIC cash after a "week or so." Now the agency says WIC should be able to provide benefits through late October, with states using \$100 million in federal contingency money released Wednesday and \$280 million in unspent funds from the last budget year.

If the aid dries up, desperate moms will probably dilute their babies' formula with water to make it last longer, or simply give them water or milk, said the Rev. Douglas A. Greenaway, head of the National WIC Association, an advocacy group. Pediatricians say children under 1 shouldn't drink cow's milk because they can develop iron deficiency anemia.

"These mothers have trust and confidence in this program, and that trust and confidence has been shaken by Congress," Greenaway said. "This is just unconscionable."

Danyelle Brents, 22, a single mother of three, receives about \$200 a month in vouchers for food and formula for her two children and baby. She is being hit doubly hard by the shutdown: She is a contract worker for the Federal Aviation Administration who catalogs records for aircraft certification, and is furloughed. Now, with her baby going through 10 cans of formula a month, she might lose key help with her grocery bill.

"That's a lot of money, \$15 a can," she said. "Now that I'm out of work, WIC is how

I support my family . . . I'm scared at this point to go buy anything extra."

Groups that fight hunger say they are also concerned about the confusion that needy mothers may be feeling. Though most WIC offices are open, many mothers mistakenly assumed that benefits were cut off.

Advocates are also worried that there will be a cumulative effect as other, smaller government feeding programs run out of money.

Adding to the uncertainty While USDA has said that food stamps are guaranteed to continue through October, it is unclear what will happen after that.

In Pennsylvania, whose \$208 million WIC program supports 250,000 women and children, all local WIC offices remain open and benefits are being dispensed as usual. The state Health Department said it has \$25.5 million on hand to continue operating the program through October. Ohio said it has enough money to last through the second week of November.

"Ohio WIC is open for business!" proclaimed the headline on a state website.

Utah's WIC program, though, immediately closed its doors Tuesday in the wake of the government shutdown, meaning that families who hadn't already received their October vouchers were out of luck and new applications couldn't be processed. The state got \$2.5 million in USDA funding on Thursday, and WIC offices throughout the state planned to reopen by noon Friday.

Charitable groups were already filling the void. A Facebook group called "The People's WIC—Utah" was launched hours after WIC offices closed, matching up families in need with those able to donate formula and other food.

In Layton, about 25 miles north of Salt Lake City, a donation drive was planned for Saturday, with organizers asking for fresh fruits and vegetables, unopened baby formula and other necessities.

Food banks, meanwhile, are bracing for a surge in requests for help if WIC runs out of money.

Linda Zimmerman, executive director of Neighbors In Need, which runs 11 food banks in Massachusetts, said her organization already provides a lot of baby formula to its clients, most of whom get WIC aid as well.

"I think they're truly nervous," Zimmerman said. "We're going to have to be doing a lot of work to make sure we can keep up with need for infant formula."

In some places, grocery stores refused to honor WIC vouchers, assuming they wouldn't get paid. Terry Bryce, director of Oklahoma's WIC program, said WIC officials called and emailed grocers to assure them the program is still funded.

In New Jersey, Patricia Jones said she is worried about losing her WIC assistance.

"You're affecting families that haven't done anything to you," said Jones, a 34-year-old mother of five. Because of the shutdown, she was turned away from the Social Security Administration office in Newark when she tried to get printouts of her children's Social Security numbers to renew her welfare and WIC benefits.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, let's be clear about what's happening here. We are in day-four of the shutdown of the federal government for one reason, and one reason alone: The desire of a radical wing of the Republican Party to dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

To that end, House Republicans have rejected the clean government funding bill passed by the Senate, and shut down the government. The shutdown could end today if Speaker BOEHNER would bring up the Senate-passed funding bill. There are more than enough votes to pass it and send the bill to

the President, who would sign it. The only reason we aren't voting on the Senate bill is because Speaker BOEHNER has not stood up to a radical group of Tea Party lawmakers who are demanding repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Instead of re-opening the entire government, the Republican Leadership is playing more games as they continue to bring up piecemeal bills to fund the most visible casualties of the shutdown they caused. Earlier this week, we had a vote to reopen the Smithsonian and the National Parks. Then we had a vote to reopen the National Institutes of Health. Then the Republicans began to feel the heat from veterans, so they brought up a bill to reopen the VA. These Band aid bills are an attempt by Republicans to give themselves political cover for causing this shutdown in the first place.

Today we have another Band aid bill before us. This bill would restart funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children through December 15. Nearly 9 million moms and kids under five living near or below the poverty line rely on WIC for healthy food, breastfeeding support, infant formula and other necessities. It's as if Republicans have just figured out that closing down the federal government has health consequences when mothers cannot provide food and nutrition for their kids.

Let me read a statement from the National WIC Association, which urges the House to reject the bill before the House. They call this Republican bill "a cynical ploy to use low-income nutritionally at-risk mothers and young children as political pawns for political ends. Funding the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) in this piecemeal, short-term, stop-gap manner is not an acceptable solution. . . . NWA urges Congress to end the uncertainty that exists in our fiscal environment and the already challenged lives of vulnerable mothers and young children by responsibly discharging and fulfilling its moral obligations to the nation. NWA will not tolerate efforts to leverage the nutritional health and well-being of pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, their babies, and young children to satisfy the political ends or strategies of policy-makers."

It's time to stop playing politics, and have a vote on the Senate's clean funding bill. It's time to end the shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1730

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Kirkpatrick moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 75 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I would like for the motion to be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, it is not surprising that the WIC program is the latest subject of the majority's ploy to use low-income mothers and children as political pawns.

WIC enjoys bipartisan support. A bipartisan poll in 2012 found the program enjoyed 67 percent approval among the American people, including 53 percent of conservatives. By providing things like fresh fruits and vegetables, low-fat dairy and salmon, tuna for breastfeeding mothers, every dollar spent on pregnant women in WIC produces \$1.92 to \$4.21 in Medicaid savings for newborns and their mothers. That just makes common sense. On Wednesday, the USDA estimated that WIC would continue operations for a week or two, thanks to a small contingency fund.

In Arizona, 29 percent of children are food insecure, and over 36 percent of Arizonans live in WIC-eligible households. In my district, the Arizona Department of Health Services in Apache and Navajo Counties says 70 percent of families were WIC-eligible in 2010.

We need this program. But the bill before us is not meant to relieve needy families. It is only a tool meant for partisan gain.

The Republican budget proposal would cut WIC 22 percent. The National WIC Association estimates that the sequester has resulted in nearly 12,000 deserting families in Arizona dropped from the rolls, yet now the majority reverses itself to fund this program.

Beyond the cynicism of this tactic, WIC cannot stand alone. It is a gate-

way to health care and social services for families, services that will remain unsustainable due to the shutdown—services like low energy assistance through the Department of Energy, immunizations through Health and Human Services, and early childhood education programs like Head Start. Where is the funding for these programs? The majority proposes a fragmented program that would be crippled.

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government for funding so that we're no longer picking and choosing the needs that we are going to meet.

Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to keep all of the Federal Government open instead of just a tiny slice?

Stop these political games. Let's get serious about helping the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires an amendment be germane to the bill that is currently under consideration.

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2 and October 3 of 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

So, Madam Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized on the point of order.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund the Federal Government? My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so all of our needs can be met.

If we are funding WIC, why aren't we providing funds for school safety? If we are funding WIC, why aren't we providing funds for supplemental nutritional assistance? Why aren't we protecting food safety for every single American? Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to keep all of the Federal Government open instead of just a tiny slice? Why are the Republicans in favor of closing down the Federal Government and denying taxpayers the benefits they've already paid for? This makes absolutely no sense to the hardworking, everyday people trying to make a living.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I wish to speak on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, on the point of order, it would be my view that you could clarify the legislative process by ruling against the point of order.

If the point of order had not been raised, the next order of business would be an up-or-down vote on keeping the entire government open. A sustaining of the point of order would mean that if we do what we've done in the last few bills, there would be a challenge to your ruling. If that challenge were to be sustained, then we could get that up-or-down vote because overruling the Chair would mean that we could get an up-or-down vote.

So you should rule against the point of order to clarify all this. We can get a clear, up-or-down vote on keeping the government open, but on the other hand, Madam Speaker, the vote on keeping the government open will be on the motion to table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, may I be further heard for just 15 seconds?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may conclude.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, if you rule against the point of order, we can have an up-or-down vote. Otherwise, the up-or-down vote will essentially be on the motion to table. We should vote against the motion to table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will rule.

The gentleman from Alabama makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding related to the special Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for Women, Infants, and Children. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair ruled earlier today, as well as on October 2 and October 3, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds on committee jurisdiction grounds.

Similarly, the instructions here propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 185, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Goodlatte	Palazzo
Amash	Gosar	Paulsen
Amodei	Gowdy	Pearce
Bachmann	Granger	Perry
Bachus	Graves (GA)	Petri
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Pitts
Barr	Griffin (AR)	Poe (TX)
Barton	Griffith (VA)	Pompeo
Benishek	Grimm	Posey
Bentivolio	Guthrie	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hall	Radel
Bishop (UT)	Hanna	Reed
Black	Harper	Reichert
Blackburn	Harris	Renacci
Boustany	Hartzler	Ribble
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Heck (NV)	Rigell
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Hunter	Rokita
Camp	Hurt	Rooney
Campbell	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Cantor	Jenkins	Roskam
Capito	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cassidy	Jordan	Royce
Chabot	Joyce	Runyan
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Coble	King (IA)	Salmon
Coffman	King (NY)	Sanford
Cole	Kingston	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Collins (NY)	Kline	Schweikert
Conaway	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Cook	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Cotton	Lance	Sessions
Cramer	Lankford	Shimkus
Crawford	Latham	Shuster
Crenshaw	Latta	Simpson
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Daines	Long	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Dent	Marchant	Southerland
DeSantis	Marino	Stewart
DesJarlais	Massie	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (CA)	Stockman
Duffy	McCaul	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Terry
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers	McKeon	Thornberry
Farenthold	McKinley	Tiberi
Fincher	McMorris	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Upton
Fleischmann	Meadows	Valadao
Fleming	Meehan	Wagner
Flores	Messer	Walberg
Forbes	Mica	Walden
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Fox	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wenstrup
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Westmoreland
Garrett	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Gerlach	Noem	Williams
Gibbs	Nugent	Wilson (SC)
Gibson	Nunes	Wittman
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Wolf
Gohmert	Olson	

Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho

Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—185

Andrews	Green, Al	Neal
Barber	Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Nolan
Beatty	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Becerra	Hahn	Owens
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Payne
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Bonamici	Holt	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Honda	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Horsford	Peterson
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Pocan
Bustos	Israel	Polis
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Capps	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Richmond
Cartwright	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Chu	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke	Kind	T.
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kuster	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Langevin	Schiff
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Cooper	Levin	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lewis	Scott, David
Courtney	Lipinski	Serrano
Crowley	Loeb sack	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Lowenthal	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Sires
DeFazio	(NM)	Slaughter
Delaney	Lujan, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	(NM)	Speier
DeBene	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Maffei	Takano
Dingell	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Tierney
Duckworth	Matheson	Titus
Edwards	Matsui	Tonko
Ellison	McCollum	Tsongas
Engel	McDermott	Van Hollen
Enyart	McGovern	Veasey
Eshoo	McIntyre	Vela
Esty	McNerney	Velázquez
Farr	Meeks	Walz
Fattah	Meng	Wasserman
Foster	Michaud	Schultz
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Waters
Fudge	Moore	Watt
Gabbard	Moran	Welch
Gallo	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Nadler	
Garcia	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—23

Bass	Labrador	Sanchez, Loretta
Cárdenas	Lummis	Tipton
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Vargas
Grayson	Miller, Gary	Visclosky
Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Waxman
Herrera Beutler	Perlmutter	Yarmuth
Higgins	Pittenger	Young (FL)
Jones	Rush	

□ 1801

Messrs. VELA and LEWIS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 164, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—244

Aderholt	Gohmert	Pearce
Amash	Goodlatte	Perry
Amodel	Gosar	Peters (CA)
Bachmann	Gowdy	Peters (MI)
Bachus	Granger	Petri
Barber	Graves (GA)	Pitts
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Barr	Griffin (AR)	Pompeo
Barrow (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Posey
Barton	Grimm	Price (GA)
Benishek	Guthrie	Radel
Bentivolio	Hall	Reed
Bera (CA)	Hanna	Reichert
Bilirakis	Harper	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Ribble
Black	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Rigell
Boustany	Heck (NV)	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Braley (IA)	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rokita
Buchanan	Hunter	Rooney
Bucshon	Hurt	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Issa	Roskam
Bustos	Jenkins	Ross
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Camp	Jordan	Royce
Campbell	Joyce	Ruiz
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Runyan
Capito	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	King (NY)	Salmon
Cassidy	Kingston	Sanford
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kline	Schneider
Coble	LaMalfa	Schock
Coffman	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cole	Lance	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Latham	Sessions
Conaway	Latta	Shimkus
Cook	Lipinski	Shuster
Cotton	LoBiondo	Simpson
Cramer	Loeb	Sinema
Crawford	Long	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Lynch	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Maloney, Sean	Southerland
DelBene	Marchant	Stewart
Denham	Marino	Stivers
Dent	Massie	Stockman
DeSantis	Matheson	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McClintock	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McIntyre	Turner
Ellmers	McKeon	Upton
Farenthold	McKinley	Valadao
Fincher	McMorris	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walberg
Fleischmann	Meadows	Walden
Fleming	Meehan	Walorski
Flores	Messer	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Mica	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Foster	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Fox	Mullin	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Gallego	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Garamendi	Neugebauer	Wolf
Garcia	Noem	Womack
Gardner	Nugent	Woodall
Garrett	Nunes	Yoder
Gerlach	Nunnelee	Yoho
Gibbs	Olson	Young (AK)
Gibson	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Gingrey (GA)	Paulsen	

NAYS—164

Andrews	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Beatty	Bonamici	Capps
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Capuano
Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)	Carney
Bishop (NY)	Brownley (CA)	Carson (IN)

Cartwright	Huffman	Payne
Castor (FL)	Israel	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Chu	Jeffries	Pingree (ME)
Ciulline	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Clay	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Keating	Quigley
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Rahall
Cohen	Kennedy	Rangel
Connolly	Kildee	Richmond
Conyers	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kind	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Courtney	Kuster	Sánchez, Linda T.
Crowley	Langevin	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Davis, Danny	Levin	Schwartz
DeFazio	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Delaney	Lofgren	Scott, David
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Serrano
Deutch	Lowe	Sewell (AL)
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Shea-Porter
Doggett	(NM)	Sherman
Doyle	Luján, Ben Ray	Sires
Duckworth	(NM)	Slaughter
Edwards	Maffei	Smith (WA)
Ellison	Maloney,	Speier
Engel	Carolyn	Swalwell (CA)
Enyart	Matsui	Takano
Eshoo	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Esty	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Farr	McGovern	Tierney
Fattah	McNerney	Titus
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Tonko
Fudge	Meng	Tsongas
Gabbard	Michaud	Van Hollen
Green, Al	Miller, George	Veasey
Green, Gene	Moore	Vela
Grijalva	Moran	Velázquez
Gutiérrez	Nadler	Walz
Hahn	Napolitano	Wasserman
Hanabusa	Neal	Schultz
Hastings (FL)	Negrete McLeod	Waters
Himes	Nolan	Watt
Hinojosa	O'Rourke	Welch
Holt	Owens	Wilson (FL)
Honda	Pallone	
Horsford	Pascrell	
Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)	

NOT VOTING—23

Bass	Jones	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardenas	Labrador	Tipton
DeGette	Lummis	Vargas
Grayson	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Heck (WA)	Miller, Gary	Waxman
Herrera Beutler	Perlmuter	Yarmuth
Higgins	Pittenger	Young (FL)
Johnson, Sam	Rush	

□ 1808

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 1804

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be permitted to file a supplemental report on H.R. 1804.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, my office has continued to be flooded by

calls from folks in North Carolina who are experiencing the negative effects of ObamaCare. Not an hour goes by in which I don't learn of another hard-working family who just received notice that, starting next year, they will face higher premiums.

Not only are everyday Americans going to have to pay more for health care, but their options for providers are being curtailed at every turn. This does not even mention, Madam Speaker, the technical glitches that, all too predictably, have emerged in the rollout of the online exchanges. They are a harbinger of the trouble ahead with this misguided law.

We are almost \$17 trillion in debt; our government has a massive spending problem; and ObamaCare will only contribute to our Nation's fiscal woes.

Madam Speaker, now is the time to stop this disastrous law in its tracks. Congress has the opportunity to provide all Americans with an exemption from ObamaCare—the same exemption the President has provided to all of his friends.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, we are now in the fourth day of a manufactured government shutdown; and despite repeated calls to end this manufactured crisis, House Republicans have yet to allow a simple majority vote on a Senate-passed bill that would pass this House on a bipartisan basis and that the President could sign today to bring operations back on line. Instead, Republican leaders have begun cherry-picking services to fund during the shutdown to mitigate the political fallout from the untenable position in which they have put our country.

Don't you think the American people see through that?

It's nice to see my Republican colleagues finally acknowledge that the government does, in fact, provide many critical services worthy of our support. These piecemeal bills are not serious attempts to reopen our government. They would not help the 800,000 dedicated public servants who have been involuntarily furloughed; they would not help my constituents applying for Social Security disability benefits; they will do nothing for small business owners who are cut off from SBA-backed loans; and they certainly don't address the women depending on rape crisis or domestic violence centers, which will lose their funding after today.

What these bills would do is merely prolong a disastrous, manufactured situation. I urge my colleagues to bring up a straightforward funding measure to get our constituents, our economy, and this Congress back to work.

□ 1815

HONORING DR. PETER MEHAS

(Mr. VALADAO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Pete Mehas, an important figure in the central valley of California, who dedicated his life to improving education and helping young people in our local community.

Dr. Mehas was a local leader with passion for education. He started his career in education as a teacher and football coach at Roosevelt High School in Fresno, California.

He was elected Fresno County Superintendent of Schools in 1990, and was reelected three more times in 1994, 1998, and 2002. He also served as Secretary of Education for former Governor of California George Deukmejian. At the time of his passing, he served as a member of the board of trustees for the California State University system.

Dr. Mehas is remembered as a tremendous motivator who encouraged people to reach their full potential. The central valley lost an iconic advocate for education, children, and minorities.

Madam Speaker, I rise with my colleagues today to pay tribute to Dr. Mehas for his lifelong dedication to helping central valley youth through his work and education and his devotion to improving the community.

HONORING DR. PETER MEHAS

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, we're here today to honor a true public servant and a longtime friend of mine, Superintendent Pete Mehas. My Republican colleagues, Congressmen Nunes and Congressman VALADAO, and I certainly have our disagreements, but among those things we all agree on is how important and meaningful the work of Pete's life was to so many in our valley and those that he touched throughout the State of California because he was a true public servant.

He committed his life to the furtherance of education for the young people throughout California. He and I worked together on so many issues, from special education, to bringing the Keeping Score program to the kids of Fresno County, to dealing with challenged school districts like West Elementary, the implementation of charter schools, and, yes, one of the last tasks that Pete did, even though he was in retirement, was to head the selection committee for the new president of Cal State University of Fresno, Dr. Joe Castro. A good selection that was.

It's time that we set our differences apart and find the solutions to the impasses that are affecting this Congress and this country today. It's what Pete

would have done. It's what we should do.

HONORING DR. PETER MEHAS

(Mr. NUNES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I'd like to pay tribute, as Mr. COSTA said, to Dr. Pete Mehas, an enthusiastic leader of the central valley and a man whom I was privileged to call my friend.

Pete was a major force in shaping and improving our local school system, serving as a schoolteacher, administrator, school superintendent, CSU board of trustees member, and he leaves a legacy of excellence and commitment that is an outstanding role model for future educators.

Pete's passion, of course, was sports, and it's hard to imagine what athletics around Fresno would be like today without his decades-long contribution as a high school athlete, college football player, soccer, football, and tennis coach, his work on sports scholarships and the Fresno Athletic Hall of Fame. Through the coaches he later hired at various schools and institutions, he left a lasting impact on the sports programs throughout the central valley.

Aside from his long list of accomplishments, Dr. Mehas was friendly, optimistic, and outgoing, with a constant, infectious smile. He was widely known in the community and deeply loved. Characteristically, he seemed to be at every Fresno State football game. I'll miss seeing him there.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, this afternoon, I was supposed to be in Memphis with the head of the faith-based group from Washington. Because of the sequester, she wasn't able to travel. Because of the shutdown, I'm here.

So we had 42 pastors come to my office with the navigators in Memphis, and we talked about the Affordable Care Act and how to sign up people in the community and what the Affordable Care Act did. It was a very beneficial program in telling people in the community how to sign people up for needed and important health care. I wish others would do the same thing. It would be constructive.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. We need to help our citizens get adjusted, get involved, and get the benefits.

LET THE SENATORS VOTE FOR FAIRNESS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, consider the common ground the House has of-

fered Senate Democrats, common ground Senator HARRY REID is squandering by refusing to talk.

We want to reopen government. We want to restore vital services. The Senate won't budge. They won't even negotiate. Why? Because ensuring fair treatment for Americans under ObamaCare is evidently too radical for some in the Senate.

The President provided big businesses a 1-year break to ready themselves for ObamaCare. Shouldn't he provide American families the same? The House thinks so. So does Democrat Senator JOE MANCHIN:

Give them at least a year, he said. You gave the corporate sector a year, don't you think it'd be fair?

Yes, because it is.

But Senator REID won't talk. He won't end the shutdown because he's insistent the double standard remains intact.

Senator REID, let's not waste the common ground we have. Let's talk. Let's treat Americans fairly. Let's open their government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. O'ROURKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'ROURKE. Madam Speaker, I received the following email from Stu Harris in El Paso yesterday. He's the vice president of the National Border Patrol Council, Local 1929. He writes:

Our Border Patrol agents in the El Paso sector are outraged by this nonsense. We cannot understand tying the fight against the Affordable Care Act with funding the government.

I can only hope that nothing happens to any of our agents in the field putting their lives on the line and doing it for free. Imagine having to be in a state of heightened awareness for 10 hours a day, all the time not knowing if or when the paycheck will come in or how we're going to pay the bills and feed our families.

Due to the shutdown, all Border Patrol agent trainees that were at the academy have been sent home. This amounts to yet another delay in adding measures to secure the border.

Madam Speaker, it is time to reopen the government and allow an up-or-down vote on funding this government.

SPENDING CUTS

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, this has been a tough week for my constituents, a tough week for all Americans.

I've been reflecting on the goals I set when I decided to run for office a little more than a year ago. I came here to tackle the growing debt that is saddling our country. I want to make sure

that we reform the way Washington spends money, and I want a better and more responsible America for my children and your children.

Madam Speaker, I hate the bickering that has consumed this institution. I dislike the fighting. But even more, I dislike the \$17 trillion in debt that's preventing American exceptionalism.

It is unacceptable that last year our country spent a trillion more than we had. It is unacceptable that our President does not want to talk about how we get out of the red or the fact that ObamaCare will add another \$1.3 trillion to our deficit.

We had historic spending reforms in this House and have begun the process to reprioritize how Washington spends your tax dollars. I will continue my efforts to get our fiscal house back in order. I will continue to advocate that we return to a constitutional appropriations process and begin passing all of our spending bills.

One of the most important powers the Constitution outlines is in article I. It is for Congress to control Federal spending. We must get back to that system of checks and balances that our forefathers designed and the Constitution demands.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I want to apologize to the people of southern Ohio in Pike County at the uranium enrichment facility for not being able to be with them today. We did not anticipate that our schedule would be completely disrupted by the shenanigans here due to the GOP shutdown of our departments of government, which is so unnecessary and so absolutely discourteous to the people of this country.

Initially, when this happened, the calls that came into our office were calls of dismay and shock and upset about the inability of this Congress to reach agreement because of a very reckless faction on that other—majority's side of the aisle.

The calls have changed. Now we're getting calls from people who've gone to apply for Social Security benefits and there's nobody there to take their application. Now we're getting calls from veterans who are returning from theater and there is nobody there to process their benefit claims.

We have over 800,000 people furloughed from the Federal Government. Guess what? One of my communities had sent officers for training at one of the FBI academies, and they're riding back home right now because that training was not available.

Madam Speaker, our responsibility is to provide a stable government that gives confidence to the people of this country, advances economic growth, and meets our responsibilities. All Republicans have to do is send a clean

continuing resolution to the floor and this could end.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I did not plan to take the floor today, but I was receiving a call this afternoon from Felecia Shelor, who runs the Poor Farmers Market in Meadows of Dan. She was calling both on her behalf and on behalf of her friends who run Mabry Mill, an establishment just off the Blue Ridge Parkway.

She told me that they were having similar problems to what we've read about with Mt. Vernon being closed down, even though it's not run by the Federal Government and isn't owned by the Federal Government. Mabry Mill is not a Federal facility, but it's just off the Parkway. We know in North Carolina there was a facility where they blocked the parking. We don't have the ability to do the regular things, but we can block the parking of businesses.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a tragedy. Sixty-some employees in the various businesses there may be affected negatively by the actions of the park service. I call your attention to this. I ask you if you're in the neighborhood, go to the Blue Ridge Parkway, travel down it, go to Mabry Mill, shop the stores nearby. They need you to show that they're not going to allow the government to play cheap tricks, as one park ranger said they were doing in an article in the Washington Times today:

We've been told to make life as difficult for people as we can. It's disgusting.

That's what an angry park ranger said.

Everyone, Madam Speaker, in this country should be angry, and they should go out to the Parkway.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, it's very clear to The Wall Street Journal, it's clear to the Chamber of Commerce, it's clear to USA Today, and it's clear to the American public that the Republican right wing, the Tea Party, has shut down the government.

Now I find out that we're going home. Speaker BOEHNER has decided that Congress will go home tomorrow. How can we possibly go home? There are people who are not being paid, people here who are not being paid. The police were not paid that work here every day. Across this country, people are not receiving what they paid for, and we're going home. I'm embarrassed about this.

We should stay here. If they can't agree to accept the fact that they lost the vote on the health care law again and again, if they can't agree to that, can they at least agree to work on jobs? There's plenty of work to do in this country, and we have no right to go home until we get this job done.

□ 1830

OBAMACARE

(Mr. MARINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARINO. Madam Speaker, my colleague who just spoke failed to tell the American people that we're going home tomorrow after we get our morning work done to hug our children, see our spouses, and we're going to be back here Monday.

So with that said, several years ago, before ObamaCare was implemented, or right after it was, the media asked the other side of the House, What's in it? And the other side of the House responded, Well, we don't know. We have to pass it to see what's in it. To see what the language says, the people are going to have to read it.

So now we are reading it. Big business is reading it; they don't like it. Unions are reading it; they don't like it. Most Americans don't like it.

So what does that mean? When ObamaCare was passed, it was supposed to cost \$900 billion and some change and cover 60 million people for 10 years. The latest numbers today, it may cover 24,000 people at a cost of just shy of \$2 trillion. Every year, this country is spending \$1 trillion more than we bring in. Who's going to pay for it? Where are we going to get the money? Borrow it from the Chinese? Or put it on the backs of the hardworking middle class taxpayers? It has to stop.

LET'S TALK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, today is a historic day. It is the fourth day of the Democrats' government shutdown. There is a profound difference of opinion on not just ObamaCare but on the size and role of government in our lives. The future course of our country and what we look like hangs in the balance. Will we continue down the path of a bigger government that takes more of our hard-

earned money, inflicts a substandard health care system on us, and tramples our rights? Or will we be a Nation of the people, by the people, and for the people that protects our rights, ensures our liberties, and allows us to keep our hard-earned money? These are big decisions. And America is watching how we, as leaders, solve these problems and come to a resolution.

As Republicans, we have been here and have put forth proposal after proposal to fund the government and keep it open and protect the American people from this onerous health care law. We have sent over to the Senate numerous proposals to keep the government open while ensuring no one gets special treatment under ObamaCare. Unfortunately, HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats rebuffed every attempt to negotiate and slammed the door to talking.

They went home last weekend. We stayed here and worked. They tabled each of our proposals. We appointed conferees. HARRY REID refused to appoint conferees. He has slammed the door to reopening government by refusing to talk.

President Obama called Speaker BOEHNER to the White House yesterday. We were encouraged. Sadly, the message was, I've called you here to tell you I'm not going to talk. I'm not going to talk. I'm not going to talk. Good-bye.

You can't negotiate if you won't talk.

My mother is a pretty special lady and a pretty wise woman. When I was a little girl, she knew how to get my sister and I talking again when we were mad after a fight. She'd make us sit in a room together for half an hour. We hated it. It was uncomfortable at first. We didn't want to make eye contact or communicate. But by the end of 30 minutes, we were always talking again, and we were ready to set aside our differences and move forward. That's what needs to happen here.

I have got a poster here, Let's talk. That's what we need to do. But instead, the President has resorted to tactics and over-the-top political stunts that are not only harmful to moving the discussion forward but are harmful to American citizens. He furloughed defense civilians and Reserve personnel. This is in spite of the legislation we passed and he signed to prevent that.

The Pay Our Military Act appropriates funds to our military and allows all defense workers to remain on the job, but the President has decided to furlough workers anyway. As a result, over 150,000 Army civilians and 75,000 Navy civilians were sent home. Reports are coming in that long overdue maintenance at shipyards is being delayed and not completed. Our national defense is jeopardized because our Commander in Chief has sidelined our military.

But that's not all. The President has chosen to try to inflict as much public pain as possible to get his way. For the

first time in history, he has closed the U.S. memorials in Washington, D.C., and around the world. Despite many of these memorials being open air venues with 24/7 access 365 days out of the year, he has spent precious tax dollars renting barricades to close them.

Earlier this week, President Obama ordered the National Park Service to close the World War II Memorial despite the fact that numerous World War II veterans had been planning for months to travel to D.C. to visit the iconic memorial as part of the Honor Flight program.

Here's a picture of what they were greeted with: instead of being greeted like heroes, these veterans came to D.C. to see metal barriers surrounding the monument in the middle of the Mall erected to honor their service and their sacrifice. There was no need to ever close the World War II Memorial other than to make a political point, as keeping these monuments open would not cost a thing and were funded primarily through private donations by those wishing to honor these veterans.

When I went down Wednesday morning to help remove the barriers for veterans from Missouri so they could see their memorial, I was ashamed of the President's action and continuous lack of respect for the men and women who fought and died for our country. The unprecedented action of closing monuments has never been authorized during any previous government shutdown by any other President, including President Clinton, and underscores this President's desire to purposely do everything in his power to make Americans suffer from his political games.

The President has since seen the public outcry and opened the World War II Memorial but only to veterans. Unfortunately, it remains barricaded to the general public and all other war memorials. President Obama has also barricaded other venues in D.C., such as the FDR Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, and the new Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial. Here they are in this poster doing that.

He, himself, dedicated this memorial in 2011. And during his dedication speech, he referenced many important milestones in the life of Dr. King and made reference to the fact that this monument was meant for all who seek freedom and testament to the numerous—and here are the President's words—"the numerous barricades that have fallen since Dr. King started his fateful journey to push for social justice."

However, the President has chosen to needlessly punish Americans who travel to D.C. to pay homage to the monument and has literally erected barriers to keep out those visitors.

In that same 2011 speech, the President points out that if Dr. King were alive today, "He would want us to know that we can argue fiercely about the proper size and role of government without questioning each other's love for this country—with the knowledge

that in this democracy, government is no distant object but is rather an expression of our common commitments to one another. He would call on us to assume the best in each other, rather than the worst, and challenge one another in ways that ultimately heal, rather than wound."

I sincerely wish the President would heed Dr. King's wise words and sit down with us so we can work out our differences instead of needlessly punishing Americans for his inability to find common ground and civilly pass legislation.

Let's talk.

Now I want to give my colleagues an opportunity to share their thoughts about this important time in history. So I yield to my good friend from Tennessee, DIANE BLACK.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, ObamaCare is having disastrous effects on Americans across this country. And in my home State of Tennessee, premiums are rising by as much as 190 percent. And now schools are being forced to reduce hours for substitute teachers.

Every day, constituents contact my office with stories about how this devastating law is hurting them. Louis in Hendersonville told me that his premiums are going up, and I quote:

We do not know how to address this huge additional burden. Please help.

Tracy in Smithville wrote to me and said:

I will have to close my business due to ObamaCare. I'm a veteran, and I have spent 21 years building this business. It's a shame that it has come to this. Everything that I have worked for will be gone because of this bill.

Jeffrey in Goodlettsville is a small business owner who wrote to me:

Please continue fighting back against this law.

My constituents and Americans across the country never supported this law that is being rammed down their throats by the President and Senate Democrats. My House Republican colleagues and I have repeatedly worked to try to protect them from the law's disastrous effects. But instead of listening to the American people, the Senate Democrats have shut down the government to protect their own ObamaCare carve-out. Madam Speaker, this is shameful. And it's past time that HARRY REID negotiate with this House to address the concerns of the American people over this disastrous law.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Diane, for those great words.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. RON DESANTIS, who knows a little bit about serving his country in multiple ways, including being a part of the Navy.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I just want to address some things that I have been hearing out there that just strike me as wrong. The President

said that ObamaCare has nothing to do with the budget. Now that is very rich, considering it was passed using budget reconciliation in order to ram it through the Senate with less than 60 votes. So it was a budget issue then. Somehow it's not now. Of course the individual mandate has been ruled a tax by the Supreme Court, and it authorizes trillions of dollars in new spending.

Now some say ObamaCare is the law and, therefore, cannot be changed. Well, this body has the constitutional authority to legislate. We can always amend or change the laws. But I would also say, if this particular law is somehow so special and sacrosanct, then why isn't the President enforcing it, as written? Indeed, he has given waivers and exemptions to politically connected entities, including a bailout for Members of Congress, giving them relief from the text of the very law that they passed without reading.

I think ObamaCare is dangerous in terms of how it's going to impact economic growth and medical care in the country. But just in terms of good government, this really is a recipe for institutionalized cronyism. You have burdens imposed on society. And then those who have political connections can get those burdens removed.

So employers can get it removed. We know there will be something for labor unions at some point. But if you are an individual, well, you've still got to abide by ObamaCare's dictates.

Some say doing individual bills is simply cherry-picking, we can't pass individual spending bills, which the House has been doing very resolutely over the last several days.

Big omnibus CRs, that is not the way business is supposed to be done. You are packing all the departments into one big bill. You are forfeiting Congress' ability to make good spending choices, forfeiting Congress' oversight authority, locking in bad policy. We haven't done appropriations bills in this House for years. A lot of this stuff that's locked into these CRs was done when we had the previous Speaker of the House. So individual bills are better. The Senate should absolutely act on our bills.

And then just finally, I would say, before I yield back to the gentlewoman from Missouri, ObamaCare is the only major piece of legislation that's passed in the last 80 years that had zero support from the other party. Social Security had 80 percent of the Republicans in the House; the Civil Rights Act had 80 percent of the Republicans in the House; Reaganomics, the Reagan economic program, had 78 percent of Democrats in the Senate. So typically, these big laws have broad bipartisan support. This one didn't. And we have a lot of constituents who didn't want it to begin with and don't like living under it now.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman. I think that is very true. It shows that we are here fighting for a

bunch of people in this country whom it's hurting. And that's why we need to repeal it or amend it or do something to stop this onerous law that's hurting people. So thanks for bringing that up.

Now I yield to my good friend from Colorado, DOUG LAMBORN.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I want to talk about negotiations. The President, unfortunately, has said he's not going to negotiate on the debt ceiling. And HARRY REID has said, he's not going to send negotiators to sit down with Republicans and talk about the continuing resolution and the government shutdown.

But that begs the question: Who does the President negotiate with? Well, take a look here. Bashar al-Assad, the dictator of the regime in Syria, who has used poison gas on his people about 15 times; 100,000 people have died in that civil war. And after the latest explosion of poison gas, the civilized world was outraged that 1,500 people were killed. And John Kerry now has entered into negotiations, with the Russians acting as intermediaries.

□ 1845

So the Russians are going to help negotiate with the Syrians. This has the blessing of the President. I wish them success on this venture. I hope the negotiations come to something, but they are willing to negotiate with these reprehensible dictators from around the world, and that includes Iran. Iran now has entered into discussions with the State Department and the President. The President has talked to the President of Iran, Hassan Rouhani, and I wish success upon these negotiations. They are trying their best.

But when you think about these characters around the world, and in some cases evil regimes that the President is negotiating with, who is he not negotiating with? The Republicans in the House.

JOHN BOEHNER is the Speaker of the House, and the Republicans in the conference represent over half the people in America. Over half of Americans are represented by Republicans here in Congress, over half the country; and yet the President won't even negotiate. HARRY REID, the Senate majority leader, won't even send negotiators to talk to House negotiators. I think this is wrong. I think we should have some negotiations. I think we should have some discussions. If these people merit negotiation and discussion, certainly half of the country, the Republicans here in the House who represent half of the country, should enter into negotiations.

So I call on the President to negotiate with the Speaker and House Republicans on the debt ceiling. I call on HARRY REID to send negotiators to meet with House Republicans to talk about the government slowdown or shutdown or whatever you want to call it.

We need to negotiate, Mr. President. We need to negotiate, Mr. REID.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Doug. What great points. We have extended our hand to the Senate and to the President this entire time, and yet we have had the door slammed in our face. But you're right, he has negotiated with others. It's time for him to negotiate with us. Thank you for bringing up those excellent points.

Now I yield to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JEB HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I especially thank her for her leadership on this Special Order, and her leadership on behalf of all of our men and women who serve in uniform, many in her district. And she is well respected within this institution for what she has done for our military.

Madam Speaker, I know the American people occasionally get somewhat confused by what is going on in Congress. Here's what's easy to understand: House Republicans have put not one offer on the table, not two, not three, but four; four different offers to negotiate with the President and the Democrats. What do we hear from the President? What do we hear from HARRY REID, no negotiations.

You know, I still recall vividly my mother-in-law who has a saying, the least you can do in life is show up. President Barack Obama and HARRY REID have not shown up. Now I know that the President says at one time in his life he taught congressional law. Some of us find that somewhat ironic because if the President actually knew the Constitution, then he would know that it is the Congress that has the power of the purse. It is Congress that appropriates funds. Nowhere will you find in the Constitution that Congress is relegated to the power of the rubber stamp. So we know that the President and HARRY REID want us to rubber-stamp the health care policies of this administration that we hear about every single day. Every single day I'm hearing from one of my constituents, Congressman HENSARLING, they just cut me back to 29 hours because of ObamaCare. Congressman HENSARLING, my health care premiums are going up \$1,500 because of ObamaCare. And yet we're told by the President, it's the law, don't touch it. Well, it's a law that he has already changed seven times, and it is a law that's hurting our constituents. And, no, Republicans are never, never, never going to give up on our quest to have patient-centered health care that's right for our families and doesn't harm our economy and is not an affront to our freedom. So we'll never give up on that.

Madam Speaker, we know that the President is not going to sign away his signature item, and we know since so much of this spending is what we call mandatory spending, automatic spending, we know that the President is not going to cooperate to repeal it or defund it, and we'll never give up our

quest. But, Madam Speaker, all we're asking for now is if ObamaCare is going to be imposed on the American people, then it ought to be imposed equally—none of these special interest deals, none of these sweetheart deals. You know what, if it's good enough for the American people, it ought to be good enough for the President.

Why wasn't he the first one, the very first one signing up for this? Why wasn't there a line at the White House? Well, I can tell you why, Madam Speaker, because, guess what, they exempted themselves. The American people are tired of Washington elites passing laws that the rest of us are supposed to live under. That's not what the American people expect, and so Republicans are asking one thing: if ObamaCare is going to be imposed on America, no special deals for big business, no special deals for big labor. If they are going to get a 1-year reprieve, then working Americans ought to get a 1-year working reprieve. And if it's good enough for working Americans, it ought to be applied to the President, his Cabinet, and everyone in the White House and the Congress.

Listen, I don't want to put my family in the exchanges. I don't want to lose the employer contribution that the taxpayers have so generously given us, but we're not going to have the President act like he can make the law. No Member of Congress, no one in the White House is above the law. So that's what we're trying to do. We want negotiations. If we're going to get stuck with ObamaCare while the President is the President, then let it be applied equally; but this is bigger than this.

Millions and millions of our fellow countrymen are either unemployed or underemployed. They need our help. This is a spending bill. The President's economic policies have failed. We want fundamental tax reform. We want to get rid of the red tape burden. We want to take our Nation off the road to bankruptcy. I say this not just as a Member of Congress, but as the father of a 10-year-old son and an 11-year-old daughter. So somehow when the President says you can't mess with this spending bill and we want you to rubber-stamp the debt ceiling, the Republicans say, no, no, no, Mr. President. We will negotiate with you in good faith and maybe the electorate gave you the White House and the Senate, but the American people gave the House to the Republican Party, and we will not sit idly by while men and women are unemployed and underemployed, wondering how they're going to feed their families. We're not going to sit idly by while he bankrupts this Nation for future generations.

No, no, no, we will not sit idly by. We are ready to negotiate, but we are through negotiating with ourselves, and the American people will demand ultimately that the President and HARRY REID negotiate and we work together to get this economy back and put us on a road to fiscal solvency so

that our best days will once again be ahead of us.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, so much. What wise words about what this fight is about for the future generations of our country and how we are fighting for a better health care system and a government that lives within its means. It's time to do that, and it's time to negotiate for the President and the Senate to come and talk to us. So let's talk.

I am glad to have a friend of mine, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP). We have the honor of serving together on the Armed Services Committee, and I really respect him and his views not only as a patriot and a member of the Armed Services Committee, but also as a doctor. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

This slowdown, shutdown has taken on many particular angles and a lot of accusation and a lot of discussion; but as we get to this point, although ObamaCare isn't driving the shutdown, it isn't merely about the millions who will still be uninsured, and its not merely about the 50 percent or more of this country who will be on Medicaid where access to care is extremely limited, and it's not only about rates going up. It is about that health care is going backwards in America, not forward. The government shutdown is not only about the fact that in Ohio we passed a constitutional amendment that made the mandate in Ohio, only to be overturned by the Supreme Court. Sixty-six percent of the people in Ohio did not want this law, and I'm from Ohio and I'm here to continue to fight for that.

I'm bothered as we go through this and I hear the arguments and I hear people referred to "terrorism," "jihad" and "bombs strapped to their chest." Well, as someone who served in Iraq as a combat surgeon during the bloodiest time of the war, 2005–2006, I guarantee you what's taking place here is not that, and it's shameful when people use those types of references. And I bet those who have served in war understand that's not appropriate.

We are here to negotiate, we're here to discuss, and we're here to represent the American people. Really, I thought when I came here, I'm new, I'm a freshman—I thought that fair treatment for all Americans would be something that's common ground for all of us. I thought that having special subsidies for Members of Congress would be something that we would all disagree with, and that would be another area of common ground.

Those are the basic premises that are driving this shutdown right now, because we have passed continuing resolutions that would fund the government completely if we would just sit down and agree that these portions of this law are wrong and they go against what we as Americans believe in, that we're to be treated fairly, that there is

no special premise for one group over the other. I thought those would be areas of common ground, and I'm surprised that this still goes on.

We'll continue to fight over things we disagree with within ObamaCare and try to improve our health care system as we go along; but it interests me when people say it's the law, get over it. Well, it's not the law that was passed when you're changing things, and that's the problem.

I wonder sometimes if the Presidential election was different. Say, for example, Mitt Romney had won and he went into the Presidency and said, I'm going to exempt this group and I'm going to exempt that group. I'm going to change the law and provide a subsidy for those it's not written into the law for. What would the outcry be? The outcry would come from me because I believe in the rule of law, and I believe in fairness under the law.

We need to sit down and figure this out. The President is the President, and he has the seat at the head of the table; but he was not the only one elected. We've all been elected to represent the people, and we all have a seat at the table, and that's what needs to take place.

I hear arguments from the other side talking about while we're passing these resolutions, you're picking and choosing now. That's exactly what ObamaCare has done. Throughout that law, there is picking and choosing. So when I hear the other side say we're picking and choosing, I say thank you for making our argument because that's what we're having problems with.

I pray for a better day. And Lord willing, we'll all sit down at the table and get these things figured out on behalf of the American people. That's what we were sent here to do, and I hope we can get that done, and I urge those who will not come forward to think about it and to come forward and sit and talk with us.

With that, I appreciate the gentlelady putting this Special Order together for us to have a chance to discuss these issues.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank you very much. You've really spoken to the heart of this whole issue. We want fair treatment for all. The President has given over 2,000 waivers from this law to special interests and to certain groups, given special treatment to Members of Congress and their staff and has said that businesses and large corporations don't have to comply for a year. But yet he has been unwilling to give a 1-year extension to the hard-working families in my district and your district and individuals who work so hard and the ones that we're hearing about, so that's not fair.

So we hope—I hope—that the President and the Senate will listen to your words tonight and be willing to come forward and to sit down with us and find that common ground, and where we can delay this for a year and move

forward as a country. Thank you for bringing up those great points.

I am very happy tonight to yield to a friend of mine from Missouri, Representative JASON SMITH. He is here and he's doing a fantastic job, and I'm very honored to serve with you. The people of the Eighth District of Missouri know that you're doing a fantastic job on their behalf. I would love to hear your thoughts at this historic time about the matters before us.

□ 1900

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Thank you very much. It's a great honor to be here this evening to talk about the effects that ObamaCare has on the folks in rural Missouri. I also want to thank my colleague and my neighbor just west of me in Missouri, Congresswoman VICKY HARTZLER, for having us and for putting on this Special Order.

Just over a week ago, I posted a question on my Facebook page asking the folks back home to give me examples and comments of how ObamaCare has affected them. It's amazing. We were inundated with people and just different story after story. I want to share a few of those stories of real families that are facing the struggles of ObamaCare back home.

We have folks all the time that ask, Is the fight worth it? Is the fight worth defunding and delaying ObamaCare? And I'll let you all decide. But let me give you a few examples.

Paul from East Prairie, down in Missouri County, in Missouri, wrote on Facebook that he checked to see what his insurance premiums would be next year after ObamaCare completely goes into effect. Paul and his family would be forced to pay \$1,035 a month, with a sky-high deductible of \$12,700. Paul said he could get coverage from his wife's employer—his wife is a teacher—but with increased costs. The employer's insurance for their family plan would take his wife's entire paycheck because of the new regulations under the Affordable Care Act, which is everything but affordable.

Madam Speaker, I ask, Is the fight to defund ObamaCare worth it?

Let me give you another example. Another constituent, Noel, said he has worked for 35 hours every year for the last 12 years. But, guess what, his employer now has changed it to where he only works 28 hours a week. Guess why? Because of the new regulations under ObamaCare.

Is the fight worth it for Noel?

Donald from Festus, Missouri, just south of St. Louis, told me that his health care premiums are rising from \$480 to \$740 per month. He went on to say that because of his increased insurance costs, he will be contributing \$3,000 less a year to our Nation's economy.

Madam Speaker, do you think fighting ObamaCare is worth it?

These are just a few examples of my constituents. These are real people, President Obama. These are people

that are affected and are required to be in this program, which you are not required to be a part of, which the Vice President of the United States is not required to be a part of, which NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID are not required to be a part of. This is wrong, folks. This is completely wrong.

In the last week, this body has voted to defund and to delay ObamaCare because it is worth the fight. Democrats in the United States Senate must now justify to the American people why the individual mandate is too harmful for businesses and unions, but should still be forced on families and individuals. The Senate must justify why special interests are eligible for waivers and delays while average Americans will be hit with an ObamaCare's tsunami of mandates, fines, and confusion.

Madam Speaker, the fight to defund ObamaCare is a good fight to have, and I will keep fighting until folks in my district are treated the same way as big businesses and special interests.

Madam Speaker, this fight is about fairness. The fight is about families in my district who are seeing skyrocketing insurance premiums and lost wages and lost jobs.

Madam Speaker, this is a fight worth fighting for.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much for those excellent comments.

This is about fairness. Fair treatment for all. That's all we're asking. That's something that Americans everywhere can agree on. So as the Senate and as the President hear these words, I hope they will come and let's talk and let's move forward with this.

Now I'm happy to yield time to my friend from south of Missouri, in Oklahoma, a fantastic representative and leader here, JAMES LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman for hosting this time to be able to talk about some of the serious issues.

Madam Speaker, I want to bring to our attention tonight something that we're trying to bring up over and over again. It is a simple injustice and an absolute avoidance of the law.

A week ago, this body, Republicans and Democrats together, agreed unanimously to make sure that the United States military, civilians, and all civilian contractors would be exempt in case there was a shutdown.

The United States military has taken the brunt of the sequestration, and in bases all over the country and all over the world they have suffered. They have stopped training missions, they slowed down the process, as they've rapidly try to adjust to very fast-moving furloughs and sequestration. But they have. They've done what they've been asked to do.

So we make sure as a body, Republicans and Democrats together, that in case we got to a government shutdown, the United States military, all civilians, and the civilian contractors that serve with them would not be affected.

We passed it. We sent it to the Senate. The Senate approved it unani-

mously. The President of the United States signed it. That's a done deal.

We are dealing with every other aspect of the shutdown or what really is to be better described as a slowdown of the United States Government, which is serious. But we knew at least the United States military would not be affected by this. They were held entirely exempt.

There were three aspects of this law. You can look it up. It's H.R. 3210.

Aspect number one: all title X individuals, all active duty military, without exception, would be held exempt from this.

Number two: all civilians that support them—all of them—if they're connected in any way as a civilian to supporting our military, they were to be held exempt from this and the government shutdown would not apply to them.

Number three: all civilian contractors.

It's a 1-page bill with very broad language giving authority to the Secretary of Defense to say whoever you determine in any area supports in any way military, they should not be affected by the government shutdown. It's clear. It's plain language.

And then it went to the United States Pentagon; and in the Secretary of Defense's office, they have a group of lawyers. And those lawyers say they're studying the law to see who it applies to and who it doesn't apply to.

For this entire week they have studied the law to see who it applies to and who it doesn't apply to, and our members of the United States military and the civilians that serve with them are on furlough this week—against the law.

Republicans and Democrats agreed 100 percent in the House and the Senate, and the Pentagon lawyers can't decide how this should work. A first-year law student could read that bill and could tell it applies to all military title X, all civilians that support them in any way, and all contractors. It's not hard language.

It is time for the Secretary of Defense to turn to the lawyers in his office and say, Release those folks. The law is clear.

Our own Defense Department is violating the law. The President is allowing it. It's time to get on with this. Why are we holding them back?

Well, the President stands up and says the Republicans are holding America hostage. The Defense Department really is holding their folks hostage, in clear violation of the law.

Let's fix it. This is not something that's hard for us. It's already been passed. Let's get on with it.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman. What a great point. It is unbelievable that the Commander in Chief of this country has sidelined his own men and women in uniform and the civilians that support and defend this country.

Thank you for bringing that up. I agree with you, we have done everything we can. When this first happened,

we signed a letter and sent it to the President. We said, We did not intend for you to be able to furlough these people. We want everyone back on the job.

So far, we haven't heard a thing. As Representative LANKFORD said, they're still studying the issue.

Well, I call on the Commander in Chief of this country to step forward and be a Commander in Chief and to put that order out to bring them back for the good of our country.

And now I am pleased to yield to my friend from Minnesota, the wonderful lady, MICHELE BACHMANN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to thank Representative HARTZLER for her wonderful leadership this afternoon. We've heard wonderful comments about why we're here and why this is so important.

People all across the United States want us in to get our act together in Congress and with the White House and put this country back in the position we've always been in—the greatest economic and military superpower that the world has ever known. But we can't be that superpower, as Representative LANKFORD of Oklahoma said, if our Commander in Chief is illegally furloughing employees who are civilians actively supporting our defense initiative when we need them at this critical time in world history.

And I want to bring attention to one particular area and underscore what Representative LANKFORD said, because this is so extremely important. It was highlighted today by one of our Members, Representative LEE Terry of Nebraska. What he told the Republicans today at the microphone was chilling. A story is written about it today in Breitbart.com by Ben Shapiro.

In the article it says President Obama is illegally furloughing civilian defense employees at STRATCOM. What is STRATCOM? STRATCOM, Madam Speaker, is where thousands of people work to deal with missile defense in the United States. That would include nuclear missile defense.

Madam Speaker, we are being told that upwards of 60 to 70 percent of the civilian employees, which are thousands of individuals, have been illegally furloughed. Their job is to secure the safety of the missile defense system in the United States and the nuclear defense system in this United States.

The most important title of the President of the United States is to be Commander in Chief because the number one duty of our government is national security.

There can be politics played in this town. We get that. You never, ever, ever, ever play politics with missile defense and nuclear defense and the safety and national security of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I call on the President of the United States, before the clock strikes midnight tonight, if nothing else, put these civilian employees

back in place at STRATCOM. The American people and the world need to know that our missile defense and nuclear defense system is at 100 percent capability.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you.

I now would like to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, JIM BRIDENSTINE. I not only serve on the Armed Services Committee with him, but he has a very good perspective on all these issues.

□ 1915

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I just wanted to take a moment because there's a lot of information out there, Madam Speaker, about what's going on in our country right now—and a lot of misinformation. I thought it would be appropriate just to set the record straight.

A little over a week ago we sent a bill to the Senate. That bill funded the entire government. It kept the government open and it defunded ObamaCare in its entirety. Senator HARRY REID and the Senate Democrats stripped from that bill the defunding mechanism and they sent it back to the House. So we looked at it and we said, What can we do that they might agree to?

Well, the President has already unilaterally delayed major provisions of ObamaCare, including the employer mandate. He did that because he saw the jobs report. People were being forced from full-time work to part-time work. Many of them were being forced out of a job. In my district, I talked to an employer that has 57 employees; they're trying to get down to 49. And guess what they did. This is happening across our country. So the President unilaterally decided he's going to delay the employer mandate.

So we said, okay, if he wants to delay that for 1 year, let's give him an opportunity to delay the entire ObamaCare for 1 year. So we passed a bill that funded the government, kept the government open, and we sent it to the United States Senate with a 1-year delay of ObamaCare. We did that at about 1 o'clock in the morning.

Interestingly, the next day, the Senate Democrats took the day off, and the day after that they didn't even show up until 2 in the afternoon. This was my first indication—as somebody who's new to Congress, I've seen a lot of crazy things—it was my first indication that maybe they wanted a government shutdown. Astonishingly, they just didn't show up. When they did show up, they tabled it.

So then we said, okay, well, what if we just delay the individual mandate? He has already given multibillion-dollar corporations a 1-year reprieve. He's given Members of Congress a subsidy. It's not written in the law; in fact, it's illegal. He had a meeting with HARRY REID and NANCY PELOSI, and the next thing you know Members of Congress get a subsidy.

So we said, look, if Members of Congress are going to get a subsidy and

multibillion-dollar corporations are going to get a break, why don't we give hardworking Americans a 1-year reprieve? So we passed a bill that funded the government, kept the government open, and delayed the individual mandate for only 1 year. Of course HARRY REID took that bill and he immediately moved to table it.

So then at about 1 o'clock in the morning we decided, okay, let's just ask for a conference so that we can have some people from our side and some people from their side get together and work this out. Astonishingly, they didn't even want that. If you can imagine that, they didn't want to sit down and talk to Members of Congress.

Interestingly, the President called on the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, to go to the White House, and he went and he talked to the President. Guess what the President told him? The President said, We're not going to negotiate. He said, We're not going to negotiate on the continuing resolution to fund the government, nor are we going to negotiate on the debt ceiling.

This is not how it's supposed to work in our constitutional Republic in split government, but that's where we are. This is indicative of the fact that this is HARRY REID's shutdown. This is President Barack Obama's shutdown. This is not the Republican shutdown. We have done everything we could to keep this government open, and HARRY REID and President Barack Obama have shut it down.

But here's the good thing. Here's what we have done: We passed a bill, and that bill said we're going to fund the troops. We passed it unanimously in the House of Representatives. We passed it unanimously in the Senate. The President signed it into law. That's a good thing.

Then we had another bill. We thought we could pass it under suspension, so it would require a two-thirds vote. That bill was to fund the veterans of the United States, the Veterans Administration. Interestingly, Members of this body on the other side of the aisle killed it, if you can imagine that. It is every bit as indefensible to kill funding our veterans as it is to not fund our troops, every bit as indefensible.

Then, after that occurred, we wanted a bill that would fund our National Guard and our Reserve. I'm a reservist. I've been on Active Duty. I've been a reservist. I can tell you firsthand that reservists serve this country every bit as honorably as those on the Active Duty side. So we wanted to fund them. And guess what? We brought up a bill. We passed it under a rule so it only required a simple majority, and we passed it. We sent it to the Senate, and they haven't done anything with it.

This is where we are. HARRY REID and Barack Obama are holding our veterans hostage and they're holding the National Guard and our reservists hostage to ObamaCare. It's that simple.

And, by the way, it's not just to ObamaCare. It's one very simple provision that is only a 1-year delay of the individual mandate. When you think about it, it's really they're holding it hostage to having a meeting. At the end, we just said, Okay, let's have a meeting. They said, No, we're not going to have a meeting, and, oh, by the way, we're shutting down the government.

That's where we are.

So I just wanted to clarify that for my constituents back home. We are opening the government one bill at a time, and we're being blocked by the Senate. Certainly it's in nobody's best interest in this country to have a government shutdown. It's nothing any of us wanted. Yet HARRY REID and Barack Obama gave it to us.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman.

I think that was very helpful to review all the steps of what we have done to keep this government open, and how each one of our attempts has been rebuffed and how the door has been slammed in our face time and time again. But we are still here. We are still working. We're not going to give up. We want to talk. We want to negotiate. And we're going to continue to put forth proposals to fund different aspects of government to make sure that people aren't harmed in this whole process.

So thank you for coming today and sharing those thoughts.

I would like to yield now to my good friend from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) just across the way here, a fellow farmer. I look forward to hearing your thoughts on this very important time.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank my colleague from the East and also my colleague from the South for their comments.

I'd like to follow up first on Congressman BRIDENSTINE's laying out the record of what has occurred. Here you see a list of the votes the House has taken since the government shutdown began.

First, as was mentioned, the Senate refused to negotiate, sit down and actually talk. That happened at 1 a.m. on October 1. Senator HARRY REID said, We're not going to talk; we're not going to negotiate.

Since then, we've gone to work. The U.S. House, House Republicans said we're going to try to take care of the veterans. Let's try to take care of funding our national parks. Let's take care of funding the NIH, cancer research for our children. Let's take care of making certain that folks that serve at FEMA are taken care of—a list of vote after vote after vote for the last 4 days.

And Congresswoman HARTZLER, I appreciate you being here to take the opportunity so that we can show we are at work. We would like to open up the government. The Senate does not.

But I'd like to point out how busy the Senate has been for the last 4 days.

This, Madam Speaker, is a list of all the votes the U.S. Senate has taken since the shutdown occurred:

October 1, the first day of the Harry Reid shutdown, no votes. Day two in the U.S. Senate, no votes. Day three in the United States Senate, not a single recorded vote. Day four—they must be getting tired over there—not a single recorded vote in the U.S. Senate. The entire week.

Now, don't forget, the weekend before, the U.S. Senate took the weekend off. HARRY REID came back into session on Monday to make certain the U.S. Government would be shut down to the applause of the White House. That was Monday. Tuesday, no vote; Wednesday, no vote; Thursday, no vote; Friday, no vote. They're home on vacation again. We're going to go back to work tomorrow, and we're going to send another bill to the U.S. Senate.

It's clear to me, Madam Speaker, it's clear to me the Senate does not want to open up the U.S. Government, but we cannot give up.

One other item I would like to mention—and the Congressman from Oklahoma has made it very clear—that under ObamaCare, every Member of Congress, every Member of the U.S. Senate, everyone in this body, under ObamaCare, is required to sign up for ObamaCare.

Monday afternoon, as the government was about ready to close, almost the last thing the President did before they locked the doors on the Federal Government is they issued a special rule to allow Members of Congress to ignore ObamaCare, to create our own health care system just for U.S. Senators and Members of Congress and our staff. The last bill we sent over said, HARRY, you know what? We're not going to take part in ignoring ObamaCare. That's the very last thing the President did before they shut down the doors.

One thing I've done personally is say, You know what? I don't accept that. I will not accept the President of the United States saying that Members of Congress and Members of the U.S. Senate—indeed, Kathleen Sebelius and the entire Cabinet—should be exempt from ObamaCare. If it's good enough for all of America, it should be good enough for them.

I went online, as many of us have done, and started to do my responsibility—I don't know if any Member has done that—and said I'm going to sign up for ObamaCare. At 12:01 a.m., when the government shut down, the Senate's going home, I'm going to sign up for ObamaCare. Madam Speaker, I've been trying to sign up for ObamaCare on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday. Here we are Friday, 91 hours later, and I still am on virtual hold.

You've seen the pictures. Go on and look it all up yourself. You can't get online. It's an absolute failure. But I will say I am absolutely required under the law, Mr. President, despite your regulations that were inspired and re-

quested by the former Speaker of this body and the current leader of the Senate, we are not exempted.

Members of Congress, Members of the U.S. Senate, Members of the Cabinet, the President himself, sign up for ObamaCare. Lead by example and do the right thing. We can open the doors of this government, put Congress back out of the role of a privileged class.

And again, one thing I'd like to remind this body, the first individual in the entire United States of America that signed up for ObamaCare, the very first individual who was willing to lead by example was a man by the name of Harry Truman.

Mr. President, if you are listening, if you have any convictions of leadership, if you have any integrity you would like to show us, sign up for the D.C. exchange; be the next person to sign up online. Hopefully it won't take you 91 hours to get through, but lead by example. No gilded class. No special rights and privileges. The Constitution says "no nobility clause." I agree with that.

I want to thank the Congresswoman from the East, my fellow sophomore, VICKY HARTZLER, for her leadership on this issue.

So let's talk. Let's have some action. And, oh, by the way, I'm confused. Was the Senate on furlough all last week, all this week? Get back to work, HARRY. I appreciate you joining the battle to open this Federal Government.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman.

I think that shows that the Senate has been, it seems like, on furlough. It's too bad they didn't have time to vote on the NIH funding bill that we sent over there that would ensure that money goes and continues for very vital research, such as cancer and Alzheimer's and diabetes and heart disease. We sent them that bill to make sure that research continues and it's fully funded, but it's just sitting over there. They haven't voted on it.

We passed a bill dealing with veterans, to make sure the Veterans Administration, everything remains open. But they haven't voted on it; it's just sitting over there.

We passed a bill to ensure the memorials stay open, to clarify and make sure the President isn't able to close them down and barricade them like he's doing now. But they're not voting on them.

This has got to stop. It's time for us to get together and talk.

I appreciate all of my colleagues who have come here tonight to share their thoughts at this very historic time in our country's history, first of all, to let people know why we are fighting. We're fighting for our families, and we're fighting for quality health care in this country, and we're fighting for fairness. We believe in fair treatment for everyone.

It's not right that the President says this health care law isn't good enough

for corporations, and I'm going to grant over 2,000 waivers for my special interest groups, but yet you, as an American family, hardworking family, you have to comply. And then I thank the gentleman for bringing up the point that, even as the law went into effect, it's unworkable; people can't even sign up.

Do you know that the President has had over half of his deadlines he hasn't been able to meet in this law, he's had to extend them? So that's why we're fighting. Let's wait just at least a year and not force every person in this country to comply.

I'm from Missouri and I know Harry Truman, and he said, "The buck stops here." The buck should stop here with the Commander in Chief when it comes to him allowing the civilians in the military to be furloughed in this country. That has got to stop.

I appreciate my colleagues who brought up this excellent, excellent point about what has happened and the travesty and the injustice and the danger that this Commander in Chief is putting our country in. It's wrong and it needs to stop.

He also needs to open up the memorials. We all understand we have differences of opinion here. We all understand we have to talk about policy. But no President ever has closed open-air memorials in this town that are open 24/7, 365 days a year. But this President has chosen to barricade not only the World War II Memorial, but also the Martin Luther King Memorial and all the others here in Washington, D.C.

□ 1930

We have learned today that they have even closed Normandy. Around the world they are closing the veterans cemeteries. This has got to stop. We can discuss the policy, but these tactics have got to change.

We want everyone in America to know tonight that Republicans, we are here willing and ready to keep working and to talk. It is time for the President and HARRY REID to negotiate, to meet with us, and to discuss our differences and come to an agreement that will result in less government—it will keep our government open though—spend less money, and protect the American people from this onerous health care law.

We can do it. The American people do it every day. We do it in our families. If we have a disagreement, we sit down and talk. My sister and I did it when we were little girls. My mom made us talk. It works.

So let's sit down, let's talk, let's work this out. Let's get our government back open, let's get all the military reinstated, let's reopen the memorials here around this country, and let's put the American people first. We can do it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETERS of California. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERS of California. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chance to hold this Special Order with some of my freshman colleagues.

I heard some discussion from yesterday, and even some tonight, and thought that it would be appropriate for some of the freshman who just got here and don't have some of the perspective that has pervaded some of the discussion, haven't been here for a lot of the most bitter battles, maybe have a little bit more of a problem-solving attitude, to give our perspective on some of these things and maybe have a constructive discussion of the government shutdown and also the debt ceiling, which I think is a very, very serious thing to discuss as part of a negotiation.

The news today in San Diego will be about the cancellation of the Miramar Air Show that was to take place this weekend. This is a great tradition for our community, an important fundraiser for military families, and really a sad casualty of the current shutdown.

I would like to start my comments by highlighting a more hidden and much more serious effect of the shutdown, just by sharing a couple of emails I received from constituents in the last 3 days. First:

I am an engineer that has supported the Navy and Marine Corps for 26 years and have always given 100 percent to ensure that our military has the best capabilities in the world. Most of the people I work with have gone above and beyond to give the Navy and USMC our very best, especially during the many years of wartime.

Due to sequestration and previous furloughs, I have already lost \$10,000 of income this year and completely depleted my family's savings account. Now I am being furloughed again and this follows 3 years of frozen pay. I am worried for my wife and two young children because I cannot pay the bills if this shutdown continues.

I do not blame one party or the other. I am sure they both think they are doing the right thing. But I worry that they do not know the pain they are causing for the families of dedicated and hardworking civil servants.

A second one:

I am writing to you today concerning our government shutdown. I am an Active Duty spouse of 15 years with two children.

We recently moved to Coronado from Naples, Italy. I have made several sacrifices over the years to follow my husband's career. I have always felt that my husband's job as an officer in the United States Navy was worthy of my sacrifices. I have stood proud by his side.

We have moved 11 times within our 15 years of service, and as always we have budgeted our housing allowance, cost of living, and pay. Today, as I read all the negative comments on social media threads, I feel as though I have wasted 15 years of my life.

I almost fell off the treadmill on the base gym this morning when it hit me: all of the holidays my husband has missed—the birthdays and the anniversaries spent alone—for what reason? For 535 of you to shut us down? Thank God I did not fall off the treadmill this morning, as now our medical staff is on furlough and the area is severely understaffed.

Finally, I am a proud American and that is why I proudly work at the Naval Medical Center in San Diego as a nurse practitioner with the Department of Surgery. I have already endured one furlough. This resulted in a 20 percent pay reduction this summer. I was grateful it ended earlier than planned, but now I am furloughed with a 100 percent loss in pay. It has to stop.

As a San Diego resident, I know you are aware that your mortgages are higher than most. I am also a single mother of two wonderful girls. This makes the additional furlough that much harder to swallow.

Please work with your fellow Representatives to make this government shutdown end as soon as possible. It is hurting the average American much more than D.C. seems to understand.

If our elected officials were forced to take a 20 percent pay reduction and have that followed by a 100 percent pay loss, I am sure the budget would be fixed. I just want to continue to do my job and would appreciate being allowed to do just that. If this continues further, I will be forced to seek other employment.

My faith in our government is failing quickly. Again, please work together to end this situation.

There are stories like that from all these Federal workers. More than 800,000 Federal workers are out of work during the government shutdown. It is not just the D.C. metro area that is affected, as you've heard. From Hawaii to Georgia, workers in regions all over the country rely heavily on the Federal Government. San Diego is the seventh-ranked city with a high share of Federal employees. We have 151,000 workers—10.9 percent of our workforce is affected by this government shutdown.

Obviously, the same is true in Colorado Springs, which is number one; Virginia Beach; Honolulu; the D.C. region; Ogden-Clearfield, Utah; El Paso; Augusta, Georgia; San Diego; and Charleston. Every one of those places has thousands of stories, just like the ones I have told.

It is important for us in D.C. to remember the effect that we are having in the real world. That has often been the biggest surprise for me, that when I leave my district and I've heard these stories and I come here, and we hear that people are talking in these terms of blame and calling each other names and not really doing credit to this institution, and far from solving the problems that have gotten us here.

I have heard a lot of people say: We don't want to shut the government down. Well, we don't have to. I have heard a lot of finger-pointing about who caused it.

But the fact is that today the power to reopen this government rests solely

within the House of Representatives. We know what we have to do. We don't have to wait for the Senate, and we don't have to wait for the President. We can pass a continuing resolution, which is the resolution that funds the government only for 6 weeks or 10 weeks that the Senate has passed. We don't have to have any amendments or anything. We can do that today—or we can at least do it tomorrow—and all these people will be back to work and we can end these stories of fear and pain that are affecting our families and the businesses that they work for.

There has been a lot of yelling about attaching conditions to the continuing resolution. We have been voting on these really literally for weeks now. I am not going to add my voice to those, but I will just say that it seems that those have run their course. None of them has gotten anywhere.

I myself supported some of these conditions. In fact, earlier this year, I voted to delay the individual mandate to match the business mandate. That wasn't something that was popular in my party. I voted for that. But in the context of this continuing resolution, I supported the repeal of the medical device tax. It happens also to be one of my major legislative priorities. I think that is a bad way to fund any part of the government. That got some Democratic votes, but didn't get any support in the Senate.

Today, we got an email from the majority leader who said that "House Republicans believe it is critical we continue to engage and offer meaningful solutions for the American people," which is why he said, on a bipartisan basis with a total of 57 different Democrats voting with us, we have passed bills to reopen the NIH, ensure that the National Guard and Reservists are paid, fund veterans benefits, reopen our national parks, and allow the District of Columbia to expend their local funds.

I voted for all these too. Most of my party didn't. But I thought we had one chance to open these areas up to make sure that they go back to work. It is not the best budgeting thing. I voted for them. But the point is they went nowhere. The Senate will not approve them. If the Senate approved them, the President wouldn't sign them.

So it is time to recognize that we have reached the end of this road and this is not getting us anywhere. We know that these things won't sell, we know that they won't get support in the Senate, and it is time to move on to a basic continuing resolution without amendment.

Now, I have heard people say—some of my colleagues on the other side—say: Well, we need to get something. I just point out that if you look at the numbers—and we all talk extensively about the need in general to control spending and lower our debt—the Senate approved spending until November at the Republican level.

President Obama's budget proposal was for \$1.2 trillion. The Senate's bud-

get was for \$1.06 trillion, or about \$2 trillion less. And the Senate approved a spending level of the continuing resolution at an annual rate of \$986 billion. That is a cut of \$72 billion from the Senate budget—that is 7 percent less than the Senate had proposed—and \$217 billion less than the President's proposed budget, 18 percent.

So to say that you needed to get something, I think certainly at this point the Republicans have won the war over discretionary spending. Now, that is not a war that people are going to give up on. But in the continuing resolution, which we are asking to vote on, have a chance to vote on in the House, the Republicans number was the number used.

At this time, I would like to yield to my colleague from the State of Washington, DEREK KILMER, who serves with me on the Armed Services Committee and also on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the good gentleman from California for organizing this time.

Far and away the most common thing said to me over the last year has been: Dear God, why on Earth would you want to be in Congress, particularly when you have two little kids and Congress is such a mess?

I will tell you, at every occasion I have responded the same way: It is because I got two little kids and Congress is a mess. I actually care about what kind of country they grow up in. I think if people who think that this is okay and sit on the sidelines, we are never going to fix it.

I will tell you, it is strange to join an organization that, according to recent polling information, is held in lower regard than head lice. Having only been here for about 9 months, I have a pretty good sense of why.

When I got here, Congress was in the process of enacting this policy of sequestration across-the-board cuts, which have had dramatic impacts in my neck of the woods where you have seen workers furloughed, cuts to critical agencies and critical services. In Kitsap County, where I serve, they have ended mental health outreach to senior citizens because of sequestration.

We have seen impacts to our region's largest employer—the United States Navy. We have seen impact after impact. If that wasn't enough, we have gone beyond—we all remember the fiscal cliff. We are now at, like, the fiscal mountain range, where we go from self-imposed crisis to self-imposed crisis. First, it was sequestration, then it was a government shutdown, and coming up next is the possibility that our Nation defaults on its financial obligations.

Unfortunately, Congress is earning the low regard in which citizens currently hold it.

Let me talk a little bit about the shutdown and how it affects the folks

that I represent. You have heard a lot about furloughs. I have got in my district 3,500 workers at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard who are now on furlough. Just outside of my district we have Joint Base Lewis-McChord—10,000 workers have been furloughed. The largest land base in my district is Olympic National Park, which is an extraordinary tourist destination which is now closed for business—103 workers at Olympic National Park out on furlough.

But it is actually not just the impact to the Federal workforce that should concern us; it is the impact to the private economy. Before I came here I spent my professional career working in economic development. I spent 10 years working in economic development in Tacoma, Washington.

I am concerned, for example, that you are seeing a delay in the issuance of Small Business Administration loans because of a government shutdown. I am concerned that this shutdown is at a cost to taxpayers of \$150 million to \$300 million a day. But primarily I am concerned that, as you have seen Congress govern from crisis to crisis, that we figured the one thing that more than anything businesses want from government.

In the 10 years I worked in economic development, the thing I heard more often from employers than anything else was that they looked to government for an environment of trust and predictability. I think Congress has completely messed that up.

□ 1945

I will tell you that I don't think it has to be like this. In fact, I came out of a reasonably functional State legislature. The last three bills we passed in the Washington State Senate before I left were a balanced budget, a debt reduction proposal and a jobs bill. Out of the 49 members of the Washington State Senate, the balanced budget passed with all but two votes; the debt reduction proposal passed with all but seven votes; and the jobs bill passed with all but one. It was largely because we worked together. We didn't define "success" as making the other side of the aisle look like a failure.

I think, frankly, given the challenges facing our country, that gig ought to be up. We should be leading by example. We ought to be working together. We should be solving problems together. I am certainly, as one of 435, trying to do that. It means, for example, when the government shuts down and when the people whom I represent are no longer drawing paychecks, I am not either. That's why I supported a bill that many of us supported that was known as No Budget, No Pay, which said: if Congress can't pass a budget, Members of Congress shouldn't get paid.

When I served in the legislature, I knocked on 52,000 doors. The biggest change in recent years was that people were home because they were out of

work. I talked to parents who were concerned that our community's largest export was going to be our kids, and the vast majority of people I talked to actually did not give a rip about whether we get more Democratic or more Republican or move more to the left or more to the right. They just want us to stop moving backwards and to start moving forward again. So, in the brief minute I have remaining, let me talk about what I think "forward" ought to look like.

"Forward" ought to look like reopening the government. End this government shutdown now. It should mean taking action to make sure our Nation doesn't default on its financial obligations, which is an act that would ensure that costs go up for our small businesses, that costs go up for our families and that everyone's retirement goes down. It means working together to ensure that we actually pass a budget, and that's going to take Democrats and Republicans in the House and in the Senate to work together to pass a budget.

We're all freshmen up here. When we went through freshman orientation, there was a presentation on how the budget process works. The way it works is that the House passes a budget, and the Senate passes a budget. Then it goes to conference. The House passes appropriations bills, and the Senate passes appropriations bills. Then they go to conference to compromise. After about 40 minutes of presenting that, they then said, Well, that hasn't happened, though, in years.

It ought to happen. We should get that back on track. We should get this country back on track. We also need to focus on the economy.

I spent a decade working in economic development. We had a sign up on the wall in our office that said: "We are competing with everyone, everywhere, every day forever." If we think our competitor nations are participating in the frivolity that our government is currently participating in, we have another think coming. China in the last decade has doubled its number of higher education institutions. They have multiplied five-fold their number of students at colleges and universities on top of the 200,000 students who are studying abroad, primarily in fields of science, technology, engineering, and math.

And what are we doing? Here we sit with a government shutdown, impeding our economic recovery, hurting our businesses in this Nation.

We can't afford this. We should stop this. We need to get people back to work, but, Madam Speaker, we need to get this Congress back to work, too. That's why all of us as freshman Members are here. We want to get this country moving forward again.

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank the gentleman.

You talked about how we define "success." I know you and I have spoken, as have many Members, about

how we can get away with what we call "success" here.

So what happens—and what has happened in this context, too—is that a number of things will be proposed, and they won't go anywhere. Then what will happen is a bunch of finger-pointing will come after: well, I proposed this, and I voted for it and I voted against it. Imagine if you were a CEO of a company that made a product and that you said, I created a great product, and I think you'll really like it.

It sounds great to the CEO, and the CEO says, Oh, that sounds terrific. How many did you sell?

I didn't sell any, but they really should buy it.

That's what Congress is doing. That's kind of how we define "success" around here: well, I stuck them with a good bill even though no one's going to vote for it. Of course, in business or in your family, you'd actually have to listen to what the other side wanted if you wanted to reach a result that was a success. That's what "success" would be, and I thank you for pointing that out.

I would also say, on No Budget, No Pay, which I also supported, it was the concept that, if Congress doesn't do its job, we shouldn't get a paycheck. We were proud that day when we worked together with our Republican colleagues, and we passed No Budget, No Pay. We forced the Senate, controlled by Democrats, to pass the first budget that they passed in 4 years. That's all well and good unless we actually talk together. I saw a picture this week of Mr. CANTOR and some of his colleagues waiting at a table for people to come have a conference. We've been waiting for that all year on this budget, and we came in good faith and tried to pass No Budget, No Pay. Wouldn't it be good if we could use this time or if we could use the next few weeks to sit down and actually hammer out a budget through that process, and this is the time to do it.

Before I turn it over to another colleague, I'll just remind my colleagues of the report from The Washington Post last December regarding President Obama's budget proposal back then, which said that, for the first time, he is formally proposing to trim Social Security benefits—a GOP demand that is anathema to many Democrats; that he is also offering to make meaningful reductions in Medicare benefits, including higher premiums for couples making more than \$170,000 a year; and that he visited each of the caucuses earlier this year and told the House Democrats, by the way, you can't take \$3 out of Medicare for every dollar you put in. He said that our corporate tax rates were too high for our companies to compete internationally.

This has been going on all year, ladies and gentlemen, with no effort to negotiate at all because it's the leadership of the Speaker here who won't appoint conferees because, apparently, they're concerned about getting it. So

we waited until this moment of crisis to talk about something that you and I have been waiting for all year.

With that, I would like to yield some time to my colleague from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER. I want to thank my colleague from California (Mr. PETERS) for the opportunity this evening to talk about civility, to talk about coming together and finding common ground and, most importantly, to talk about getting things done.

I first ran for Congress because our Congress here, our government, was mired in dysfunction, and I truly felt that our country needs our help. I want to say that I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are new Members of Congress, including the gentlelady in the chair, share that concern. We have found common ground on a number of issues. I was very proud to work with another freshwoman, Mrs. WALORSKI, to pass a bill unanimously in this House to help victims of medical, sexual trauma. We came together, and we got 110 bipartisan sponsors, so I know that what we bring to this august body is the ability to find common ground.

Then, as now, my goal is to bring people together. These are common-sense solutions. My colleague Mr. PETERS has just reiterated discussions that have been going on in various rooms in this building—from the White House to Capitol Hill—throughout this year about entitlement reform, about tax reform, about controlling spending, but, most importantly, about providing the services that people across this country need from our government.

I come from New Hampshire, the Granite State. We are frugal people, and New Hampshire families don't need more bickering in Washington. They need real solutions to grow the economy, to foster job creation and to expand opportunity for the middle class. That's what they sent me here to do. One of my staffers said to me today that, after the week we've just had, you can't fix the roof when it's pouring out by plugging up just a few holes.

We've got to come together and solve the whole problem; and I, for one, know that we can do it. I know that we actually have the votes in this body right now to come together and take that vote, a bipartisan vote, to get the country and our government opening again.

Honestly, Granite State families don't expect Congress to agree on everything. We don't. We have significant differences. Some of them are religious. Some of them are political. Some of them come from our backgrounds and our life experiences. We have real disagreements on issues of significant importance to our country, but they do expect us to work together when we can find areas of agreement. We cannot have cooperation without open dialogue. That's what we're asking for here tonight—civility—which is a common theme, and coming together and creating dialogue, especially now.

This is the moment for which we ran for Congress. Our government is lurching from crisis to crisis, and what the American people expect and need from their leaders is to come together and find that common ground, to work across the aisle, break the gridlock, end the shutdown, take this bipartisan vote, and restore services for the people we represent and get our country and government working again. We won't get this done solely with Democratic ideas or Republican ideas. Frankly, I don't care if an idea is proposed by a Republican or a Democrat. If it's a commonsense solution to the problems we face, let's support it.

In New Hampshire, here is how we get things done. I've been making calls all week back to my district as we've been here, voting, to find out what is the impact of the Federal Government shutdown and what I can do to help. So I've talked to mayors all across my district. Let me tell you that these are real people's real lives, and it's going to cause serious pain. I called a small town up north, near the Canadian border. It is a paper mill town. They've lost thousands of jobs in this community.

So I asked the mayor, What is it that's happening on the ground there?

He started to tell me about a woman who works for the United States Department of Agriculture, and what she does is help with rural economic development. She helps with small business loans.

He said, She's not at work—she has been furloughed—and there are eight small business applications sitting on her desk.

Now, this is a small town. If there are eight small businesses in this town that won't get those loans and can't create new jobs, that's a problem.

Because this is the kind of person he is and this is the kind of town it is, he said, And she is a single mom without a paycheck.

He wanted me to know that.

Then I talked with mayors of big cities and smaller towns. I talked to businesses. I wanted to understand what's the impact on the business community. Now, I've talked to lots of Federal employees this week, and I've talked to their unions, and I have tremendous compassion for the folks who have been sent home, but I want my colleagues across the aisle to understand the impact on our economy.

So, today, I was talking to large employers. These are government contractors. They're vendors. They build things, and they provide services for our military, for IT—for everything that we use in this country to keep us safe and to keep us strong. They said thousands of jobs will be lost; and if you read the headlines today, we have already lost thousands.

I know that, with civility and trust and mutual respect, we can resolve these tired, partisan battles and that we can renew our focus on what really matters: fostering job creation, making

smart spending cuts, taking the responsibility to reduce the deficit, encouraging innovation, growing the economy, growing opportunity for the middle class. With a little more civility in the Halls of Congress, I am confident that we can resolve this crisis and redouble our focus on our shared priorities.

Finally, I spoke with our Governor. Our Governor, Maggie Hassan, said to me, Annie, tell them how we get this done in New Hampshire.

We have a Democratic Governor and a Democratic House and a Republican Senate. It sounds familiar. It's a little bit twisted from what we have here in Washington, but it's the same effect. It's a divided government. Yet, in New Hampshire, we don't see it as a divided government. We see it as an opportunity to reach across the aisle and to bring people together and find common ground.

She said, Remind them that we have just passed a budget in New Hampshire that was unanimous in the Republican Senate, virtually unanimous in the Democratic House, signed by the Democratic Governor and, most importantly for all here in Washington, it was a balanced budget. The revenues and the expenditures were equal.

□ 2000

That's what I'm talking about here today. Come together and have the discussion about how to get our fiscal house in order, how to create jobs, and how to provide opportunity.

Finally, I'm going to close with a phone call that I got this week, SCOTT, that made a tremendous difference in my perspective on this. It was a crackly line coming into my office. A young intern answered the phone. When she could finally understand the speaker on the other end of the line, he said, This is Joe. I'm calling from Afghanistan.

He is a soldier in Afghanistan, and he's there to serve our country. He said, I am here working hard for my family and my country, and I want you to do the same.

The message that Joe had for me is that he wants affordable, accessible health care for his family and for families all across New Hampshire and all across this country. He said, Do not give up on that, but you have got to open this government.

People need the help that they deserve. Our economy needs the strength and the vitality. We can't leave thousands of people without their jobs, without their pay. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to please bring this vote to the floor. We can pass this with a bipartisan vote, and we can move our country forward.

I thank the gentleman from California for giving us this opportunity.

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank the gentlelady from New Hampshire. Again, you're absolutely right. All we have to do to get this started again is to put the Senate resolution before this

House. We could vote on that tomorrow, and the government would be open immediately thereafter. I think obviously that's what we would all like to do.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. First, I want to thank my good friend from California (Mr. PETERS) for organizing this important discussion this evening and reminding all Americans how important it is to end this ridiculous and disgraceful shutdown we're in right now.

The damage this manufactured crisis is causing is unacceptable. I've heard daily from hundreds of my constituents who have already felt the pain from the shutdown over the past 4 days. They all express the same sentiment: Enough already. I share this frustration.

I received a letter today from a local Navy veteran, and it particularly stood out to me. I just want to share a brief part of this story that I read.

I'm a recently discharged veteran of the U.S. Navy.

During the 5 years I served, I was told continually that when I left the service behind, I would be taken care of, and I believed that implicitly. Well, I couldn't have been more wrong.

Since I was discharged over 2 months ago, I've struggled to get unemployment and find work. I am currently receiving VA disability for service-connected injuries, or at least I was before the government shut down yesterday.

I rely on my disability to survive, and now I don't even know when the next payment will arrive. To complicate matters further, I've attempted to start up school and use my GI benefits only to find out that the VA will run out of money by the end of this month if the shutdown continues. So no more disability or education benefits, benefits I've earned, benefits I got for sacrificing 5 of the best years of my life for. So, essentially, I paid into this program, made sacrifices too numerous to count, was deployed around the world twice in support of the global war on terrorism, and now I come to find out all of that amounts to nothing.

This shutdown has negatively impacted my life more than I ever thought possible. The mere fact that veterans benefits were even on the table as part of the shutdown is an outrage in itself. Have we not done enough? What more do I need to sacrifice? We have a hard enough time surviving overseas, and this is the treatment we come home to, our own government shutting down and unable to take care of us.

I plan on applying for food stamps soon. I never dreamed my life would come to this, especially after serving my country. But, hey, I guess that's what our government has come to.

Please do whatever it takes to end this shutdown.

Well, Joshua, I never dreamed it would come to this either, that our Nation would be willing to break its promise to the brave men and women like you over partisan games.

I called Joshua today to let him know that I, too, am appalled and that I am here fighting for him, alongside my colleagues, alongside our Nation's veterans, seniors, and all Americans who have had enough, enough of the shutdown, enough of the games,

enough of these manufactured crises. That is why I'm leading efforts urging leadership to immediately vote on reopening the government. Our fragile economy cannot afford one more day of this disgraceful shutdown, and neither can veterans such as Joshua.

I urge the House to pass a clean spending bill immediately and put an end to this nonsensical shutdown.

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I guess it is cold comfort to Joshua to hear that the House has been voting on these piecemeal approaches. I'm not saying that they were ill-motivated. Many of us supported them, but they're not working. It is time for us to learn the lesson, I believe, and I agree with you. Put the Senate resolution on the floor and open this government back up, and we can do our work in Congress that we were sent to do and we were paid to do without stopping the government. I think those comments were very well put, and I thank the gentleman.

The other thing we heard about, in addition to we need to get something or we need to sit down and talk, is the idea that we have to repeal or do away with the health care law. I would just say this about being a freshman. We weren't here for these votes. None of us cast a vote either way on the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare, but we heard a lot of questions about it and we took those questions very seriously. Most of us said we should try to fix them, but we're also realistic.

We've seen that the health care law was passed by Congress a few years ago, signed by the President; it was okayed by the Supreme Court, and it survived a number of additional repeal votes here in the House of Representatives. It appears that it's here to be with us to stay. It's been rolling out with mixed reports this week, but I think in many places people are finding hope that they can get affordable health care. Clearly, we have more work to do, and I stand here willing to help fix the Affordable Care Act to the extent we need it.

I've expressed my own concern about the medical device tax. I think that's something that should be repealed. There are others, like the Cadillac tax. I think we should provide new incentives for wellness. I think we should get out of the way of technology and encourage technology as an approach to lower costs. I'm willing to get to work on that.

That law took a long time to pass. It was very contentious. Those problems won't be solved to the satisfaction of the Congress or to the completion of the task within the time we're talking about while shutting the government down, so let's get to work and not hold the government up for that.

My final observation about this shutdown is that I feel I'm reminded of when I practiced law and I tried cases. I liked having a case with a good lawyer on the other side, because a good

lawyer knew where he or she was going, and you could tell kind of what the strategy was and where you were going to end up. I feel, in this case, like I'm trying a case against a lawyer who is inexperienced or doesn't know what he's doing in the sense that I can't figure out where he's going. I'm hoping that if there is some resolution that can happen, we would love to be a part of it. I think it starts with passing the continuing resolution that the Senate passed and getting this government open right now.

I would like to close with a few comments on the other issue that we haven't gotten to, but I think it concerns me greatly. That's the debt ceiling. It's one thing to argue over the continuing resolution—we've been talking about that—and shutting down the government. That's a bad thing. It's something I hope we'll end soon. As I said before, it's something that's entirely within our power to do without the help of the Senate or the President. We just vote for that resolution that the Senate passed, and the government would be open tomorrow.

I hear talk about the debt ceiling as though it's the same thing. It is not. The debt ceiling is a dangerous tactic for negotiation. It's bad business, it's bad economics, and it's bad government.

First, I'd start by talking about what it's like to do business in this way, and it occurs to me that my parents must be asking themselves about the people who would play with the debt ceiling. Who raised these people?

What we're doing here with the debt ceiling, talking about not paying our debts, it's like getting the credit card bill, opening it up and seeing how much you bought, and deciding at that point, Well, no, I've got to control spending. I don't want to pay this. That's too late to have the discussion.

I remember my parents—my father is a minister. My mom stayed home, worked part time to help us with college. I have vivid memories of them laying out the bills on the dining room table to make sure they could figure out their cash flow, how they were going to pay each bill, what day of the month each bill was due. They made every payment because they always taught me about making sure you kept good credit. We know now about credit scores and how important it is to be on time, and families all over the country understand that kind of approach. For us to take this approach that we're not going to pay the debts that we've incurred is just the wrong way to do business, and it's terrible economics.

The Treasury reported this week:

With the government likely to exhaust its cash reserves around October 17, the Treasury said being forced into nonpayment of any of its obligations—and in particular, its debt—would spark turmoil in the financial markets and possibly send the country back to recession as deep as that of 2008 and 2009.

We know we've been coming out of that, but very slowly. We don't want to go back there.

In the event that a debt limit impasse were to lead to a default, it could have a catastrophic effect not just on financial markets but also on job creation, consumer spending, and economic growth.

Credit markets could freeze, the value of the dollar could plummet, U.S. interest rates could skyrocket, the negative spillovers could reverberate around the world, and there might be a financial crisis and recession that could echo the events of 2008 or worse.

This is not some political statement. This is what we're hearing from The Wall Street Journal, from the banking community, from the financial sector. They're saying stay away from this. CNNMoney said:

Forget the current government shutdown. Economists say it's the upcoming debt ceiling impasse that could plunge the Nation into a recession.

About half of the 22 economists surveyed by CNNMoney say a recession will be unavoidable if Congress fails to raise the Nation's debt ceiling before the Treasury runs out of cash later this month.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's not get to that point.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot mess with the debt ceiling. The government shutdown is bad enough. We're kind of playing around the edges. I urge that we put the Senate resolution before the House so we can vote on it and open this government tomorrow. Let us not touch, let us not play with the notion, let us not suggest to anyone that America won't pay the debts it's incurred.

Finally, from an article called "After the Shutdown" posted by James Surowiecki, I just offer this—he is speaking in partisan terms, but anyone who thinks this I think it applies to:

This is why the Republican approach to the debt ceiling is not, as people like Zeke J. Miller of Time have argued, the kind of hostage-taking that's a "standard way of doing business in Washington." This is really an attempt to remake the legislative process itself and to do so by threatening to do something—default—that no one, including the people making the threat, believes to be in the best interest of the United States. We can't be sure of exactly what would happen if the U.S. stopped paying its bills, but at the very least it would lead to havoc in the bond market and the financial system (which depends on U.S. treasuries as risk-free collateral), higher interest rates, and an immediate hit to economic growth. It's not a road that anyone should want to go down.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, it is not a road we should even be considering going down. As bad as the continuing resolution is and the fight over the shutdown, I know that just behind us is a much more dangerous prospect, and I want to warn of that.

Finally, I suggest to folks that I have offered two bills that would provide an alternative and would help us deal with the national debt. They would work very simply. When debt was declining as a percentage of the economy, which means we have it under control, the debt ceiling would adjust without a vote, payments would go out; and when debt started to increase as a percentage of the economy, which means we're

not having it under control—we all understand that long-term debt can't continue to rise as a percentage of the economy without hurting our economic future. In that case, we need a mechanism to do something more than just yell at each other and call each other names, which I know the freshmen that were with me tonight are still amazed that that's what happens here, but that's what happens way too often.

□ 2015

We need a mechanism to force a discussion of really how to manage the debt. And our bill would provide that, if we are in the condition where debt's rising as a percentage of GDP and the President and the leaders of Congress didn't do anything about it, which is a condition we find ourselves in today, then individual Members, Mr. Speaker, would be able to propose their own measures without the blessing of leadership but with the sponsorship of only 50 of their colleagues to force a discussion on how to manage that debt and get it under control. Now that's just one idea. But at this point, I think it's the only idea on the table to actually avoid this in a constructive way.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to offer some thoughts on these issues with my colleagues. And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk about ObamaCare, as most people call it. It's just difficult after the hundreds of stories we're getting from back home—not just me, but so many Members of Congress. It's just hard to call it the “Affordable Care Act” when we're hearing from so many that are saying, it's so very unaffordable.

It was interesting, so many members of the media were chomping at the bit to find somebody who was able to get online and sign up for ObamaCare successfully. They grabbed a young man, Chad Henderson. He talked Thursday about his Internet experience, applying for insurance through the Affordable Care Act, through the Web site. So he was kind of a media icon.

Gee, this young 21-year-old kid, this young man from Georgia got right on, and signed up for ObamaCare. Then we find the rest of the story. So many were using his story. Oh, Chad Henderson. He got signed up very easily.

But here's a story by Kate Harrison today, on Friday, that says:

A day after a 21-year-old Flintstone, Georgia, man became the subject of national media attention—including a front page Times Free Press story—for being one of the first Americans to actually get through ObamaCare's glitchy Web site and enroll for coverage, he acknowledged that he hadn't completed that process.

Amidst the initial publicity, Chad Henderson was hailed by supporters of the Affordable Care Act as an example of the new system working and was attacked by those against the law for buying into the plan and for being a volunteer for Organized for Action, a nonprofit promoting President Barack Obama's agenda.

Today, a libertarian magazine, Reason, called Henderson's account into question after a conversation with Henderson's father, who said that he and his son had not actually bought a plan off of the ObamaCare site yet.

In an interview today with the Times Free Press, Chad Henderson confirmed that he hadn't actually purchased a plan, but he insisted he hadn't lied. He said the confusion was in the wording.

“I never actually said I purchased a plan,” he said. “I said that I submitted an application, and so I enrolled. I haven't actually paid for a plan, though I found one that I liked. I never meant to mislead anyone.”

When he first talked with the Times Free Press on Thursday, Chad Henderson said he had “picked” a bronze plan from Blue Cross Blue Shield of Georgia that had a premium between \$175 and \$200. He said that the specific plan fit into his budget, though he wished it covered more.

In his initial tweet, Henderson said “Enrolled in #ObamaCare just now! Looking forward to having affordable health care for the first time!”

Today, Henderson said he stood by those comments, but repeated that he never specifically said he had purchased a plan.

Then Ace of Spades apparently does a lot of online looking and comes up with some interesting things. He posts this today:

Chad Henderson actually disclosed that he was a partisan paid to post “advocacy things” on social media.

So who's the bad guy here? Chad Henderson was not coy about his passionate support of Barack Obama or his volunteer (?) position with OFA. And here he says, “Something you should know about me,” and then discloses he's paid to post advocacy stuff.

And then it has an inset where the following is quoted from his posting:

I'm often labeled “the guy who always talks about politics.” And it normally has negative affects LOL. So I'm here to clear things up. If you were to hang out with me one night, you'll see I'm not that obsessed with politics at all. Yes, I do post political stuff on here and other social networking sites, but it's for good reason. For one, I think it's good if people get some insight into the world they live in. Secondly, I work for an organization that pays me quarterly to post the political stuff as advocacy. So it's kind of my job.

It's kind of the way it seems things go around here. You have people with the Tea Party who seem to have one thing in common—they all pay income tax. Different races, age, national origin. I've met people at Tea Parties from countries all over the world, as I've been around the country. They pay income tax. They want the government to be responsible.

And as we've been out each day to the World War II Memorial, where somebody in the administration thought it would be cute to make veterans suffer, would create a good visual image of how much suffering, since

they knew 21 out of 21 stories by the mainstream media would blame the Republicans, which they did. I thought, Wow, if they will all blame the Republicans even though they appointed negotiators, ask us to just negotiate, we wouldn't negotiate. We told them we wouldn't negotiate because we knew the mainstream media would blame everybody on the Republican side so we could do whatever we wanted. So let's create as much pain in this country as we possibly can because the mainstream media will help us ensure that the American people are duped into believing Republicans are to blame.

So this was the game from the beginning. There were no paid veterans out there from World War II to see the memorial that was constructed to them. They were out there hoping to roll in their wheelchairs down the granite open sidewalks, around the outdoor open air memorial that was constructed in such a way it would never have to be closed, that it could be open 24/7.

And I can tell you, I've been down there all hours of the day and night—10 p.m., 10 a.m., 2 a.m., 4 a.m. And no, I don't drink. I just go down there sometimes with folks to see the memorials that were constructed for America. And most of the time, I don't see any park rangers, no Park Service people.

But someone in this administration, some people in this administration thought it would be really cute to put barricades up at the World War II Memorial, the open air granite sidewalk, open 24/7 without guards most of the time, that would be cute. Because that would really play well in the media.

Then we find out, as protesters came down there as we were getting some more veterans in this week, Patrick Poole, a reporter, had his camera going when he saw these protesters, these union protesters coming, protesting supposedly because they're Federal workers who were put out of a job and are out there protesting, demanding Republicans get them back to work.

When one with a McDonald's employee shirt on was asked about—they saw the McDonald's shirt, Patrick said, How much are you getting paid to come protest? And he says into the camera, \$15. Well, it took an SEIU supervisor, who must have put the whole thing together, to come running over eventually to explain, Oh, but he works as a franchisee in a museum. He was not a Federal worker. He worked for McDonald's, and he got paid \$15 to go protest down where these World War II veterans in wheelchairs were just trying to enjoy a moment which for so many of them was very poignant, very emotional as they thought about their time in the Atlantic, in the Pacific, fighting for freedom in lands so far from home.

To some, it's a game. We heard the leak from the administration that, Why would we bring this shutdown to an end in this Obama administration when we're winning, as if it were a game.

People know that right here at this podium, I have criticized Speaker JOHN BOEHNER. Let me tell you, he had it right today when he said, This is not a game. You're playing with people's lives. But apparently, it's a game to some.

In the Organizing for America, the new-found ACORN that's gotten all this money to support the President's agenda, they're organizing, they're lobbying like crazy and, apparently, paying people to come protest and create havoc where some World War II vets are just trying to observe their memorial. It's not a game to them.

It's apparently a game to some in this administration who are not satisfied to close the Normandy Cemetery. We heard from some from Texas who had been scraping their money together because they knew the patriarch of their family may not have long—certainly would not have another chance in his life to go back to Normandy, where he fought, where his friends died. They scraped together money and got him over there only to find that whoever it is in this administration—and it starts at the top, and it stops at the top—but whoever made the call decided, let's inflict emotional pain and suffering not only on the World War II vets—that will look good because the Republicans will be blamed—but how about over in Normandy. People get clear! Oh, yes, that will be great, won't it?

Because the mainstream media, they'll blame Republicans. And then they'll be furious at them. And just like whoever it was in the administration today that said, You know, why would we stop the shutdown? We're winning. They think they're winning when Americans travel before the end of their lives to see where they fought for liberty and their friends are buried there. Some kind of game. This is not a game. These are people's lives.

Here's a report from Todd Starnes today entitled, "Catholic Priests in Military Face Arrest for Celebrating Mass":

The U.S. military has furloughed as many as 50 Catholic chaplains due to the partial suspension of government services, banning them from celebrating weekend mass. At least one chaplain was told that if he engaged in any ministry activity, he would be subjected to disciplinary action.

□ 2030

Archbishop Timothy Broglio of the Archdiocese said:

In very practical terms, it means Sunday mass won't be offered. If someone has a baptism scheduled, it won't be celebrated.

They were told they cannot function because those are contracted services and since there's no funding, they can't do it even if they volunteer.

John Schlageter, general counsel for the archdiocese, said any furloughed priest volunteering their services could face big trouble. He said:

During the shutdown, it is illegal for them to administer on base and they risk being arrested if they attempt to do so.

Look, one thing we know for sure about the military, the Commander in Chief is in charge. And I know there are a lot of distractions, but somebody needs to get word to the Commander in Chief that his military members are not going to be allowed to get to mass if they are Catholic and their Catholic priest has been told that he can be arrested if he shows up on post because the Commander in Chief can give an order and that's gone, and every Catholic priest that wishes to volunteer that has got clearance will be back on that post or base to provide mass.

For goodness sake, we have more suicides in our military now than at any time in the history of the country. You might have thought that would have been at Valley Forge. But, no, it's now and in this time in this country's history. Good grief, Mr. President, let the Catholic masses go. Rescind the order that you won't even let them volunteer there. They are people that are serving this President, Mr. Speaker, that deserve to have the comfort of their spiritual ministers.

My friends here, I respect and I really do, I appreciated their comments because as they've indicated they're freshmen and they are new. They talked about the Democrats and they talked about to get budget conferees. Wow, after all these years, the Senate finally passes an unrealistic budget, after the President waited longer than any other time and violated the law to get a budget out, and he put it out at a time when it was past time to be helpful. We are way beyond budgets at this time.

The Federal Government in this country is in a new year fiscally, so budgets are not what does it now. Now we are into appropriations; and before the shutdown we had a bill that after three compromises were offered, we said, okay, here's our negotiators, all you have to do, HARRY REID, appoint negotiators and we can have this done by morning and the people in the country won't even have to know. At least send negotiators. And as we have found out today, the administration does not want to end the shutdown because they believe they are winning this game while real people are suffering.

I heard my friend, my heart went out to Joshua, a military member who was in the military for 5 years, 1 year longer than I served, and he couldn't find a job, and now he's told his benefits are about to end at the end of the month if the government is still shut down. He can't find a job, and he may have to apply for food stamps.

Well, I would think my Democratic colleagues would come and say, you know what, ObamaCare clearly has done damage, just as the economists have said it would, and it has, and businesses have repeatedly told us it was going to create havoc in the workplace, and it has. And we have ongoing reports of businesses, because of ObamaCare, having to lay off full-time employees and put them to part-time

so that they can continue to be competitive and stay in business. And some have said even doing that because of ObamaCare, they are going to be crushed. They may not make the year in business. So, yes, our hearts go out to Joshua. Let's at least stop ObamaCare for a year. It isn't working, and it has got people not working, and it is costing people more than they ever dreamed it would cost.

Here's another from one of my constituents:

I just ran quotes for one of my insurance clients in Marshall, a family of four. I was shocked when their premiums were not lower than their current rate. President Obama said insurance rates would go down \$2,500 per year in one of his many speeches in the past. I have to quote one of my heroes and one of your fellow Congressmen who said "You lie." Please note a \$2,121.12 increase for this family if they change their insurance to an approved ObamaCare plan for 2014.

So that's about a \$4,600 swing wrong from what the President said.

This says:

I did not attend Harvard, but I can add and subtract. This family's current cost is \$706 per month. The new and improved government-approved plan is \$882.76 per month, and this is the lowest price for this family.

He goes on. It's a lengthy letter. He's obviously upset for clients who are not going to keep the same insurance at the same rate. We have heard from so many who have lost their doctor, lost their insurance.

Here's another. This one has quotes from a letter he got.

"Dear Paul." It has his full name. He's another one of my constituents.

Thank you for trusting Anthem with your health plan. We recently sent you a letter explaining how you can continue your coverage with us. If you've already chosen to change your policy effective date and extend your coverage through December 1, 2014, then we'd like to thank you for your continued patronage. You can disregard the message below. However, if you have not decided on your health plan for the coming year, you need to know that your current plan is being discontinued. Starting January 1, 2014, we're no longer able to offer or renew your plan because it doesn't meet the requirements of the new health care reform laws. Your new plan, Anthem Core DirectAccess, is available at \$224.25 per month.

Paul says:

I currently have a plan that costs me \$65 a month, and I have a \$5,000 deductible. It just covers me. The new plan with the same benefits is 3.45 times what I am currently paying.

He's pretty upset so I won't read everything he says. But he says:

My wife and I now have to make rather large sacrifices to raise the extra \$1,908 so we can keep a plan that is already mediocre.

I won't read the rest of that. He's pretty upset.

We got another insight into the strategy. Here's a story from Wesley Pruden:

The games politicians play: Barack Obama is having a lot of fun using the government shutdown to squeeze the public in imaginative ways. The point of the shutdown game is to see who can squeeze hardest, make the

most pious speech and listen for the applause. It is a variation on the grade school ritual of "you show me yours, I'll show you mine."

President Obama is not a bad poker player, but the man with all the chips always starts with the advantage and he gets all of the aces. He has closed Washington down as tight as he dares, emphasizing the trivial and the petty in making life as inconvenient as he can for the greatest number. It's all in a noble cause, of course. Access to most memorials is limited and often in curious ways. The Lincoln Memorial is easy to reach, with the streets around it remaining open. But the Martin Luther King Memorial is made difficult to reach, relegating it, you might say, to the back of the bus. Not very nice.

The Park Service appears to be closing streets on mere whim and caprice. The rangers even closed the parking lot at Mount Vernon where the plantation home of George Washington is a favorite tourist destination. That was after they barred the new World War II Memorial on the Mall to veterans of World War II, but the government does not own Mount Vernon; it is privately owned by the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association. The ladies bought it years ago to preserve it as a national memorial. The Feds closed access to the parking lots this week even though the lots are jointly owned with the Mount Vernon ladies. The rangers are from the government, and they're only here to help. "It's a cheap way to deal with the situation," an angry Park Service ranger says of the harassment. "We've been told to make life as difficult for people as we can. Its disgusting."

So for somebody here in Washington at least who is giving park rangers orders to make life as difficult as possible, it is a game. There was a time in America when we had a President, we had Congress Members who would encourage people in this country that there was always a way to make something happen. And the volunteer spirit across this land made us the envy of the world because people volunteered. We could do anything. And yet people around Washington have seen just what the park ranger said. They've been told make things as difficult as possible. So here is a playground in Washington, D.C., that never has a Federal officer there supervising it I'm told by people whose children play their constantly, but they found a need to go lock it up and somebody spent a bunch of money all over this town printing up new things to emphasize not just closed, I'm sure they have plenty of closed signs they could use, oh, no, we have to print up all new signs that say because of the Federal Government shutdown, this National Park Service facility is closed. And they're putting it in places that isn't even National Park Service facilities.

Well, they're following their orders. They're making life as difficult as they can for as many as they can.

Here's another: "Because of the Federal Government shutdown, all national parks are closed," and this one is at the World War II Memorial. See the wide open sidewalks. They're made of granite. They're not going to hurt them. I can tell you, there are enough veterans, there are enough people, those of us who have served, we're not

going to let people deface this. Yes, it is possible somebody could sneak down there in the night and do that. And I can tell you they could sneak down there and do it at night even with the barricades. So the only people that barricades like this stop are people like our World War II veterans in wheelchairs because somebody has given the order, the disgusting order, to make life as difficult as possible for as many people as possible, maybe they'll blame, they will surely blame the Republicans, even though we're the ones who refused to even appoint negotiators to negotiate, as called for in the Constitution, the law, and the rules of the House and the rules of the Senate. I didn't like the idea of appointing conferees. It was basically a capitulation. All right, all right, you didn't like our compromises, here's our people to compromise. You don't have to worry, I wasn't one of those that Speaker BOEHNER appointed, and you wouldn't even appoint people to come sit down and talk about it.

Instead, rushing around all over the place, shutting places like the Moore Park, the Moore family farm that has been around since George Washington days in the 1700s. It hasn't taken a Federal dime since 1980.

□ 2045

They sent park rangers over to Virginia Tuesday to run the McLean Chamber of Commerce out of the farm, costing the farm money, costing the Chamber all kinds of headaches as they tried to relocate, for no reason other than what we have learned is someone gave the order to make life as difficult as you can.

So this farm that really gets a lot of business in fall—this is their prime time—the director says they have lost \$20,000 because they rented barricades to put up to block a park that doesn't get a dime of Federal money.

People all over the country are finding the same thing. And it's time it stopped. This is not a game. Let's help Americans for a change.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through October 6 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO H.J. RES. 85, NATIONAL EMERGENCY AND DISASTER RECOVERY ACT

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2013.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I here-

by submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the aggregate budget levels and committee allocations set forth pursuant to H. Con. Res. 25, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as deemed in effect by H. Res. 243. The revision is for new budget authority and outlays for provisions designated as disaster relief, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, contained in H.J. Res. 85, the National Emergency and Disaster Recovery Act. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act. For purposes of such Act, these revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as included in the levels of the budget resolution, pursuant to section 101 of H. Con. Res. 25 and H. Rept. 113-17, as adjusted.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. RYAN of Wisconsin,
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year	
	2014	2014-2023
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,761,492	1
Outlays	2,811,568	1
Revenues	2,310,972	31,089,081
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending:		
Budget Authority	6,079	1
Outlays	230	1
Revenues	0	0
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,767,571	1
Outlays	2,811,798	1
Revenues	2,310,972	31,089,081

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2015-2023 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

	2014
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	966,924
OT	1,117,675
Global War on Terrorism:	
BA	92,289
OT	48,010
Adjustment for OMB Correction to BCA Spending Caps:	
BA	549
OT	308
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending:	
BA	6,079
OT	230
Total Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,065,841
OT	1,166,223
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	749,400
OT	738,140

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 5, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3226. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule —

Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mason, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1141; Airspace No. 12-ASW-12] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3227. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Commerce, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0269; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-3] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3228. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Bryant AAF, Anchorage, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0433; Airspace Docket No. 12-AAL-5] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3229. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacles Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30911; Amdt. No. 3546] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3230. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30912; Amdt. No. 3547] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3231. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30910; Amdt. No. 3545] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3232. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30909; Amdt. No. 3544] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3233. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Austro Engine GmbH Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0164; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-10-AD; Amendment 39-17513; AD 2013-14-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3234. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0638; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-026-AD; Amendment 39-17519; AD 2013-15-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3235. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0623; Direc-

torate Identifier 2013-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-17516; AD 2013-14-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3243. A bill to provide support for K-12 teacher professional development programs at the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3244. A bill to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to provide support for organizations to promote the Manufacturing Skills Certification System; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 3245. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a maximum threshold for episode reimbursement to skilled home health agencies under Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3246. A bill to amend the Pay Our Military Act to ensure that all civilian and contractor employees of the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard are paid in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 88. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for operations of the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, and the United States Merchant Marine Academy for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H. Res. 372. A resolution providing for the consideration of legislation to reopen the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 3244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 3245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TERRY:

H.J. Res. 88.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WATT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 32: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 274: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 366: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 460: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 494: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 508: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 541: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 562: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 647: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 685: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 728: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 784: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 812: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 855: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 863: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 920: Mr. ENYART, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 952: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1000: Mr. SIREN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1015: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1024: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1187: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1250: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1252: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1429: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1461: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1620: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1652: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1677: Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 1725: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 1731: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 1750: Mr. COTTON.
 H.R. 1751: Mr. BERA of California.
 H.R. 1771: Mr. GOWDY.
 H.R. 1803: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1814: Mr. RADEL.
 H.R. 1884: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2001: Mr. HANNA and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 2182: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 2241: Mr. McCAUL.
 H.R. 2288: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 2385: Mr. ROTHFUS.
 H.R. 2480: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 2504: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 2509: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 2548: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 2591: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 2675: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 2694: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 2697: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 2727: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 2839: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2866: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 2907: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ENYART, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. ROBY, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 2911: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 2939: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3040: Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 3086: Mr. RADEL, Mr. LONG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 3090: Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 3097: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 3108: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 3118: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
 H.R. 3121: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 3142: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 3150: Mr. ENYART and Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 3151: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 3160: Mr. FORBES, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. YODER.
 H.R. 3163: Mr. CLAY, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 3179: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 3223: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BRALEY of

Iowa, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 3224: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3232: Mr. LANCE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. VELA, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3236: Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 3239: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 3241: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROSS.
 H.J. Res. 34: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.J. Res. 56: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H. Res. 97: Mr. MULVANEY.
 H. Res. 247: Mr. ENGEL.
 H. Res. 348: Ms. LEE of California.
 H. Res. 355: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TAKANO.
 H. Res. 365: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. TONKO.